

THE  
CAMBRIDGE HISTORY OF  
ENGLISH LITERATURE

EDITED  
BY  
SIR A. W. WARD  
AND  
A. R. WALLER

VOLUME XIV  
THE NINETEENTH CENTURY  
PART III

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS  
CAMBRIDGE  
LONDON • NEW YORK • MELBOURNE

Published by the Syndics of the Cambridge University Press  
The Pitt Building, Trumpington Street, Cambridge CB2 1RP  
Bentley House, 200 Euston Road, London NW1 2DB  
32 East 57th Street, New York, NY 10022, USA  
296 Beaconsfield Parade, Middle Park, Melbourne 3206, Australia

ISBN 0 521 04528 2

First published 1916

New impression 1922

Cheap edition (text only) 1932

Reprinted 1934 1953 1961

1964 1967 1976

Printed in Great Britain

at the

University Printing House, Cambridge  
(Euan Phillips, University Printer)



## PREFATORY NOTE

*The Cambridge History of English Literature* was first published between the years 1907 and 1916. The General Index Volume was issued in 1927.

In the preface to Volume I the general editors explained their intentions. They proposed to give a connected account of the successive movements of English literature, to describe the work of writers both of primary and of secondary importance, and to discuss the interaction between English and foreign literatures. They included certain allied subjects such as oratory, scholarship, journalism and typography, and they did not neglect the literature of America and the British Dominions. The History was to unfold itself, "unfettered by any preconceived notions of artificial eras or controlling dates," and its judgments were not to be regarded as final.

This reprint of the text and general index of the *History* is issued in the hope that its low price may make it easily available to a wider circle of students and other readers who wish to have on their shelves the full story of English literature.



## CONTENTS

|                 |  |               |
|-----------------|--|---------------|
| <i>Chap. I.</i> | Philosophers . . . . .   | <i>page 1</i> |
|                 | By W. R. SORLEY  |               |
| II.             | Historians, Biographers and Political Orators . . . . .            | 50            |
|                 | By SIR A. W. WARD  |               |
| III.            | Critical and Miscellaneous Prose. John Ruskin and others . . . . . | 138           |
|                 | By HUGH WALKER   |               |
| IV.             | The Growth of Journalism . . . . .                                 | 167           |
|                 | By J. S. R. PHILLIPS   |               |
| V.              | University Journalism . . . . .                                    | 205           |
|                 | By V. H. RENDALL   |               |
| VI.             | Caricature and the Literature of Sport. <i>Punch</i> . . . . .     | 212           |
|                 | By HAROLD CHILD  |               |
| VII.            | The Literature of Travel, 1700—1900 . . . . .                      | 240           |
|                 | By F. A. KIRKPATRICK   |               |
| VIII.           | The Literature of Science.   |               |
|                 | A. Physics and Mathematics . . . . .                               | 257           |
|                 | By W. W. ROUSE BALL  |               |
|                 | B. Chemistry . . . . .   | 271           |
|                 | By M. M. PATTISON MUIR   |               |
|                 | C. Biology . . . . .   | 281           |
|                 | By A. E. SHIPLEY   |               |
| IX.             | Anglo-Irish Literature . . . . .                                   | 302           |
|                 | By A. P. GRAVES, M. A.   |               |
| X.              | Anglo-Indian Literature . . . . .                                  | 331           |
|                 | By E. F. OATEN   |               |

|                  |   |                 |
|------------------|---|-----------------|
| <i>Chap. XI.</i> | English-Canadian Literature . . .                               | <i>page</i> 343 |
|                  | By PELHAM EDGAR   |                 |
| XII.             | The Literature of Australia and New<br>Zealand . . . . .        | 361             |
|                  | By HAROLD CHILD   |                 |
| XIII.            | South African Poetry . . . . .                                  | 372             |
|                  | By SIR HERBERT WARREN   |                 |
| XIV.             | Education . . . . .   | 381             |
|                  | By J. W. ADAMSON  |                 |
| XV.              | Changes in the Language since Shake-<br>speare's Time . . . . . | 434             |
|                  | By W. MURISON   |                 |

## CHAPTER I

### PHILOSOPHERS

#### I. INTRODUCTION

ENGLISH philosophy may be said to have touched low-water mark in or about the fourth decade of the nineteenth century. The general public had ceased to be occupied with matters of speculative thought, and the universities did little or nothing to keep an interest in them alive. Writing in 1835, John Stuart Mill complained that philosophy was falling more and more into disrepute and that great events had ceased to inspire great ideas.

‘In the intellectual pursuits which form great minds,’ he said, ‘this country was formerly pre-eminent. England once stood at the head of European philosophy. Where stands she now?... Out of the narrow bounds of mathematical and physical science, not a vestige of a reading and thinking public engaged in the investigation of truth *as truth*, in the prosecution of thought for the sake of thought. Among few except sectarian religionists—and what they are we all know—is there any interest in the great problem of man’s nature and life: among still fewer is there any curiosity respecting the nature and principles of human society, the history or the philosophy of civilization; nor any belief that, from such inquiries, a single important practical consequence can follow!’

About the same time, or a few years earlier, similar views concerning the low estate of English philosophy had been expressed by Sir William Hamilton and by Thomas Carlyle<sup>2</sup>; and a foreign observer—Hegel—had spoken with scorn of the usage of the word ‘philosophy’ in the English language.

The writers who made this complaint were foremost in bringing about a change. Without any approach to philosophical method, Carlyle forced upon public attention ideas concerning the ultimate meaning and value of life, and, in his own way, had an influence upon the thought of his time which may be compared with that of Coleridge in the generation

<sup>1</sup> *Dissertations and Discussions*, vol. 1, pp. 96, 97.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Masson, *Recent British Philosophy*, 3rd edn, pp. 2–5.

immediately preceding. Hamilton and Mill were the leaders of a marked revival of interest in speculative topics, which reinstated philosophy in its due place in the national culture; and this revival took two different directions connected with their diverse views and training.

Philosophy, however, had not merely to overcome the public indifference referred to by John Stuart Mill; it had also to contend against itself, or, at least, against its dominant form. The Benthamite creed, which was in the ascendant, was not favourable to speculative enquiry. 'The great problem of man's nature and life' was regarded as solved in a sense which made metaphysics and theology alike impossible; ethical principles were held to be finally settled by Bentham, so that nothing remained but their application to different situations; even political and social theory, the field of the chief triumphs of the utilitarians, was divorced from history and from every ethical idea save that of utility; psychology, however, remained in need of more adequate treatment than Bentham could give it, and James Mill supplied the school with a theory of mind which was in harmony with their other views.

## II. JAMES MILL AND OTHERS

The economic doctrines which are characteristic of the utilitarian school were elaborated by a writer who cannot be regarded as a member of it and who, indeed, was not interested in philosophy or even in the larger questions of social theory. This was David Ricardo, the son of a Dutch Jew who had settled in London and become a member of the Stock Exchange. Thrown on his own resources, Ricardo soon made a fortune as a stockbroker, retired from business at an early age and devoted his leisure to economics. It was not until he had already made his mark as a writer on the currency that he became acquainted with James Mill, by whose encouragement, as well as by that of other friends, he was induced, in 1817, to publish his chief work, *Principles of Political Economy and Taxation*. Ricardo received his impetus towards economic study from Adam Smith. He did not share the latter's breadth of social outlook or his psychological insight; but he had a masterly power of abstract reasoning which enabled him to present economic doctrines in the form of a deductive science. He was concerned not so much with the 'nature and causes' as with the distribution of wealth. This distribution has to be made between

the classes concerned in the production of wealth, namely, the landowner, the capitalist, and the labourer; and Ricardo seeks to show the conditions which determine the share of each. Here, his theory of rent is fundamental. He did not claim originality for this theory, which goes by his name, but attributed it to Malthus's *Inquiry into the Nature and Progress of Rent* and Edward West's *Essay on the Application of Capital to Land*, both of which appeared in 1815; while his editor, J. R. McCulloch, discovered the same doctrine in a work by James Anderson, entitled *Enquiry into the Nature of Corn-Laws* and published in 1777. But Ricardo made the doctrine his own. Rent, he argued, does not enter into the cost of production; it varies on different farms according to the fertility of the soil and the advantages of their situation. But the price of the produce is the same for all and is fixed by the conditions of production on the least favourable land which has to be cultivated to meet the demand; and this land pays no rent. Rent, therefore, is the price which the landowner is able to charge for the special advantages of his land; it is the difference between its return to a given amount of capital and labour and the similar return of the least advantageous land which has to be cultivated. Consequently, it rises as the margin of cultivation spreads to less fertile soils. Obviously, this doctrine leads to a strong argument in favour of the free importation of foreign goods, especially corn. It also breaks with the economic optimism of Adam Smith, who thought that the interest of the country gentleman harmonised with that of the mass of the people, for it shows that the rent of the landowner rises as the increasing need of the people compels them to have resort to inferior land for the production of their food.

The value of an article is determined, according to Ricardo, by the amount of labour required to produce it under the least favourable conditions; and this value has to be shared between wages and profits (interest on capital and earnings of business management not being distinguished in his analysis). Wages depend on the price of necessities (that is, chiefly, of food); the law of population (which he takes over from Malthus) prevents any further rise. On the other hand, profits depend on high or low wages. Thus, in the progress of society, the 'natural tendency' of profits is to fall, until 'almost the whole produce of the country, after paying the labourers, will be the property of the owners of land and the receivers of tithes and taxes.'

There is, therefore, an opposition of interests within the body economic ; and this opposition is held to be the result of natural and inevitable law—'happily checked,' however, at repeated intervals, by improvements and discoveries. For their effect Ricardo made allowance. But he took no account of other than economic motives in human conduct ; he may be said to have invented the fiction of the 'economic man,' though he did not use the phrase. And he regarded the economic structure of society as rigid, though his doctrines often read like satires upon it, and they became, in the hands both of contemporary<sup>1</sup> and of later socialist writers, a powerful argument for fundamental social changes.

Ricardo's method was to proceed from a few very general propositions about society and human nature, and to draw out their consequences deductively. That his premisses were one-sided generalisations, and that his conclusions at best had only hypothetical validity, he did not recognise. This method was also characteristic of the Benthamite reasoning in political theory generally. Thus it was that, in economics, James Mill professed himself Ricardo's disciple. Mill's *Political Economy* (1821) reduces Ricardo's doctrines to text-book form, and states them with the concise and confident lucidity which distinguished the author. For Mill, however, unlike Ricardo, economics was only one amongst a large number of topics, social and philosophical, which were open to the same general method of treatment, and which appealed to his interest. Mill was closely associated with Bentham—at any rate, from 1808 onwards—and it is difficult to find any originality in the fundamental doctrines of his creed. At the same time, he had certain points of superiority. Much inferior to Bentham in jurisprudence and all that concerned the details of law, he had, perhaps, a clearer view of political theory and certainly a wider knowledge of historical conditions. He was, of course, a whole-hearted adherent of the greatest happiness principle, and added nothing to its statement ; but he was better equipped for its defence on philosophical grounds and he could supplement Bentham's deficiencies as a psychologist. But the necessity of making an income by literary work and, afterwards, the demands of official employment, as well as, always, the engrossing interest of public affairs, left him little leisure for philosophy.

<sup>1</sup> See the bibliography by Foxwell, H. S. in appendix II (pp. 191—267) of the English translation of A. Menger's *Right to the Whole Produce of Labour* (1899).



Mill's systematic work in political theory is contained in certain articles, especially an article on government, contributed to the supplement of *The Encyclopaedia Britannica*, edited by Macvey Napier (1820). In these articles, the author proceeds, methodically, to determine the best form of political order by deductive reasoning; and his method was the object of severe criticism by Macaulay in an article contributed to *The Edinburgh Review* in 1829, but not republished in his collected *Essays*. This article contained also an attack on the utilitarians generally; and Mill's rejoinder, so far as he made any, is to be found in *A Fragment on Mackintosh* (1835). This consists of 'strictures on some passages' of *A Dissertation on the Progress of Ethical Philosophy* which Sir James Mackintosh had contributed to the seventh edition of *The Encyclopaedia Britannica*. Like Mill, Mackintosh was keenly interested in philosophy, although his career gave him little time for its pursuit. In this, his only contribution to the subject, he reviewed the work of the English moralists with appreciation and insight. It contained criticisms of the utilitarians and of their intellectual predecessors which aroused Mill's hostility, and its occasional lack of precision of thought laid it open to attack. Mill's 'strictures' are limited to a few points only, and expose the weaknesses of his antagonist's positions in a manner which would have been more effective if it had been less violent—although his friends had induced him to moderate its tone before making it public.

Mill's chief philosophical work was, however, his *Analysis of the Phenomena of the Human Mind* (1829). In this he laid the foundation in psychology for the utilitarian superstructure. It is a compact statement of a theory of mind elaborated on the same method as that by which any department of nature might be studied. Mental phenomena are reduced to their simplest elements, and the association of these into groups and successions is investigated, all association being reduced by him to one law—that of contiguity. In general, Mill follows Hume and Hartley—but Hartley much more than Hume. He disregards, however, the physiological side of Hartley's theory, so that his own doctrines are purely psychological. To the psychological school of a later date, whose leading representatives were John Stuart Mill and Alexander Bain, his chief positive contribution was the doctrine of inseparable association; in addition, he marked out afresh the lines to be followed by a theory which attempts to explain the facts of consciousness from the 'association' of ultimate

elements called 'sensations'—assumed as themselves not in need of explanation.

A position intermediate between the associationism of Mill and the traditional doctrines of the Scottish school was taken by Thomas Brown, professor of moral philosophy at Edinburgh from 1810 till his death in 1820. By the time he was twenty years of age Brown had published *Observations on the Zoonomia of Erasmus Darwin* (1798), which was recognised as a mature criticism of that work. Seven years afterwards, in 1805, an ecclesiastico-academical controversy drew from him a small volume entitled *Observations on the Nature and Tendency of the Doctrine of Mr Hume concerning the Relation of Cause and Effect*, of which a second enlarged edition was published in 1806 and a third edition, further enlarged and modified in arrangement and title, in 1817. In this book, he maintained the view that causation means simply uniform antecedence, 'to whatever objects, material or spiritual, the words may be applied'; but he held, also, that there was an intuitive or instinctive belief that, 'when the previous circumstances in any case are exactly the same, the resulting circumstances also will be the same.'

Brown's work on causation certainly showed him to be possessed of an intellect of penetrating philosophical quality; and it may be noted that, in his preface to the second edition of it, he already laid down two principles which distinguished his subsequent writing. One was that the 'philosophy of mind' is to be considered as a science of analysis; the other was the implicit rejection of the doctrine of mental faculties as it had figured in previous academic philosophies. Functions such as memory or comparison, he says, are merely names for the resemblances among classes of mental facts. In his *Lectures on the Philosophy of the Human Mind* (1820), published after his death, these principles were applied to the details of perception and cognition. He made the important distinction between the muscular sense and touch proper, resolved knowledge of extension into a succession of muscular sensations, and knowledge of the external world into a number of constituent sensations, but held, nevertheless, to the real existence of the physical object on the ground that it was implied in the intuitive belief in causality. In these doctrines, and in his analysis of 'relative suggestion,' he made contributions to psychology which were largely original, although he was considerably indebted to De Tracy and other predecessors. The eloquence of his style, as well as the subtlety of his analyses,

made his lectures famous during his lifetime and, in their printed form, for many years after his death. They were written hastily, each lecture to meet the demand of the following day, and they are too ornate in style for scientific purposes. The shortness of the author's life, and his own unfortunate preference for his poetical works over his philosophical, prevented a thorough revision of what he had written or a consistent and adequate development of his views.

### III. SIR WILLIAM HAMILTON AND OTHERS

Hamilton's reputation has not withstood the test of time; but, in his own day and for a number of years afterwards, his was one of the two names which stood for the revival of philosophical thought in Great Britain. His pre-eminence was not altogether undisputed, however. Even from his younger contemporaries who did most for Scottish metaphysics, different opinions regarding his merit may be gathered. Ferrier regarded him, morally and intellectually, as 'amongst the greatest of the great'<sup>1</sup>: whereas Hutchison Stirling found in him 'a certain vein of disingenuousness that, cruelly unjust to individuals, has probably caused the retardation of general British philosophy by, perhaps, a generation<sup>2</sup>.' The truth lies somewhere between these extreme views, and it is important to arrive at a correct estimate of Hamilton's work in order to understand the course of British philosophy.

Sir William Hamilton was born in 1788, in the old college of Glasgow, where his father was a professor. He was educated there and at Oxford, was called to the Scottish bar and, in 1836, appointed to the chair of logic and metaphysics at Edinburgh. In 1844 he had a stroke of paralysis, and, although he was able to continue the work of his professorship until his death in 1856, he never recovered his physical strength. His published work began with a number of articles in *The Edinburgh Review*, republished in 1852 as *Discussions on Philosophy and Literature, Education and University Reform*. The most important of these were three articles on 'the Philosophy of the Unconditioned,' 'the Philosophy of Perception' and 'Logic,' which appeared between 1829 and 1833. He afterwards devoted himself to the preparation of an edition of Reid's *Works*, which he illustrated with elaborate appended 'Notes,' chiefly historical in character. This work was

<sup>1</sup> Ferrier, J. F., *Scottish Philosophy: the old and the new* (1856), pp. 15, 16.

<sup>2</sup> Stirling, J. H., *Sir W. Hamilton: being the Philosophy of Perception* (1865), p. vii.

published in 1846; but the 'Notes' were never completed and are of the nature of material rather than of literature. After his death, his *Lectures on Metaphysics and Logic* were published in four volumes (1858—60).

Hamilton's positive contributions to philosophy are connected with the topics of the three articles already named. Indeed, except as regards logic, these articles contain almost all that is essential and original in his work. But other points have to be taken into account in estimating his influence upon philosophical thought.

Since the time of Descartes, continental thought had had little effect upon English philosophy. Leibniz and even Spinoza were hardly more than names. Helvétius had influenced Bentham, and De Tracy Thomas Brown; but Helvétius and De Tracy themselves worked on lines laid down in England—the lines of Locke. The doctrines of Locke, Berkeley and Hume, together with the ideas of the deistical movement, had entered into the European tradition; but the reaction which they produced, and which began with Kant, was for long ignored in England. One or two enthusiasts tried to make Kant known, but their efforts were without result; an article on Kant by Thomas Brown in the second number of *The Edinburgh Review* (1803) only showed the poverty of the land. Coleridge, indeed, was a much more important medium; he brought into English literature ideas which had been derived from Kant and his successors, and he was recognised by John Stuart Mill as representing a type of thought, antagonistic to the dominant Benthamism, which had to be reckoned with. But the teaching of Coleridge was prophetic rather than scientific, and the philosophical student had to be approached in his own language and by a master who had the command of traditional learning as well as fresh doctrines to teach. It was here that Hamilton's cosmopolitan learning broke in upon British philosophy and lifted it out of the narrow grooves into which both the Scottish academic teachers and the English Benthamites had fallen. Hamilton's learning struck most of his contemporaries as almost superhuman; it was certainly vast, and, as certainly, without precedent at the time. It made possible a new orientation in philosophy. The special problems to which discussion had become restricted were seen as part of a larger field of enquiry which extended over the whole of western thought from ancient Greece to modern Germany. Hamilton, however, had the defects of his qualities. He never obtained easy mastery of his own learning; he would summon a 'cloud of witnesses' when a single good argument would have been more to

the purpose; and his selection of 'authorities' was often ill-judged: they were numbered instead of weighed; and he would spend time over third-rate schoolmen or equally third-rate modern Germans which would have been better spent if devoted to a sympathetic understanding of Kant and Hegel. Nevertheless, Hamilton's work in this respect is important. He overcame the provincialism of English thought and he brought it into connection with the greatest of the new German philosophers. It may have been an imperfect Kant that he revealed; Fichte, Schelling and Hegel were brought forward as objects of criticisms only. But the traditional circle of English thought was broken, and new ideas were brought within it.

Hamilton came forward as a reconciler of Scottish and German thought—of Reid with Kant. It was only an imperfect synthesis that he worked out, but the enterprise was notable. His logical work, indeed, stands to some extent apart. He followed Kant in his strictly formal treatment, and he devoted a large amount of time, and no little ingenuity, to the elaboration of a modification of the formal doctrine of the traditional logic. This modified doctrine made a great stir for many years, and was even hailed as the greatest logical discovery since the time of Aristotle<sup>1</sup>. It is known as 'the Quantification of the Predicate.' Hamilton's own expositions of it are incomplete and are contained in appendixes to his *Discussions* and to his *Lectures*. The clearest accounts of his views have to be sought in *An Essay on the New Analytic of Logical Forms* (1850), by his pupil, Thomas Spencer Baynes, and in *An Outline of the Laws of Thought* (the first edition of which was published in 1842), by William Thomson, afterwards archbishop of York. But the gist of the matter can be put very shortly. According to the traditional view, in a judgment or proposition, an assertion is made about something; that is to say, the subject is said to possess or not to possess the quality signified by the predicate. When made not about an individual thing, but about a group or class, then the assertion may be meant to apply to every member of the class or only to some of them; it is, therefore, necessary to indicate this, or to express the quantity of the subject. The predicate is not similarly quantified. But a quality is always potentially a class—the class of things which possess that quality. The most elementary of logical operations implies that it can be treated as such and assigned a quantity as the subject of a new proposition. Hamilton's 'new analytic' depends upon

<sup>1</sup> Baynes, T. S., *Essay on the New Analytic* (1850), p. 80.

the contention that the quantity thus implied should be always explicitly stated, and consists in following out the changes in formal procedure which seem to him to result from this being done. But Hamilton was not thorough enough in the elaboration of his theory. He did not see that it implied a change from the 'predication view' to the 'class view' of the proposition and that this would lead to a very different classification of propositions from his, and, in general, to a much more radical revision of logical forms than he contemplated. Two contemporary mathematicians—Augustus de Morgan and George Boole—went further than he did; and the latter's treatise entitled *The Laws of Thought* (1854) laid the foundations of the modern logical calculus.

Hamilton's article on 'the Philosophy of Perception' is both a defence of Reid and, at the same time, a relentless attack upon Thomas Brown. It is also an attempt to formulate and justify the doctrine of 'natural realism' or 'natural dualism' in a form less ambiguous than that in which it had been stated by Reid. 'In the simplest act of perception,' says Hamilton, 'I am conscious of myself as the perceiving subject and of an external reality as the object perceived.' As regards the latter factor what we have is said to be 'an immediate knowledge of the external reality.' This clear view almost disappears, however, in the process of discussion and elaboration which it underwent in Hamilton's later thought. In the course of his psychological analysis, he distinguished sharply and properly between the subjective and the objective factors in the act of cognising external reality; the former he called sensation proper and the latter perception proper; and he even formulated a 'law' of their inverse ratio. He elaborated, also, the old distinction of primary and secondary qualities of matter, to which, *more suo*, he added an intermediate class of secundo-primary qualities. As a result of these distinctions the doctrine of 'immediate knowledge of the external reality' is transformed. The object of perception proper, it is said, is either a primary quality or a certain phase of a secundo-primary. But we do not perceive the primary qualities of things external to our organism. These are not immediately known but only inferred; the primary qualities which we do perceive 'are perceived as *in our organism*.' That is to say, when we perceive a table, we do not perceive the shape or size of the table; knowledge of these is got by inference; the shape and size which we perceive are in our own bodies. The existence of an extra-organic world is apprehended through consciousness of

resistance to our muscular energy, which Hamilton calls a 'quasi-primary phasis of the secundo-primary' qualities<sup>1</sup>. From this view it follows that no immediate knowledge of external reality is given by sight; and yet it would be hard to show that the 'testimony of consciousness,' to which Hamilton constantly and confidently appeals, makes any such distinction between things seen and things touched.

The value of Hamilton's 'philosophy of the conditioned,' as he called it, is not easy to estimate, chiefly owing to the difficulty of stating the exact sense in which he held his favourite doctrine of the relativity of human knowledge. His most striking production is the first article he published—that on 'the Philosophy of the Unconditioned.' It is a review not directly of Schelling or Hegel, but of the eclectic system of his French contemporary, Victor Cousin. The unconditioned, in his use of the term, is a genus of which the infinite (or unconditionally unlimited) and the absolute (or unconditionally limited) are the species; and his contention is that it is not an object of thought at all, but 'merely a common name for what transcends the laws of thought.' His argument follows lines similar to those used by Kant in exhibiting the antinomies of rational cosmology, though it is applied to the conclusions of post-Kantian speculation. According to him, there cannot be any knowledge of that which is without conditions, whether it is called infinite or absolute; knowledge lies between two contradictory inconceivables, one of which must be true though neither can be conceived; all true philosophy is a philosophy of the conditioned. 'To think,' he says, 'is to condition.' This statement, however, involves two positions which he does not take care to keep distinct. It implies that we cannot know the infinite or whole, which in its nature must be without any conditions; and it may also be taken as implying that our knowledge of the finite parts is not a knowledge of them as they truly exist, but only as they are modified by our way of knowing. This latter position, though very definitely stated by Hamilton, is not clearly carried out. He follows Kant by laying chief stress on space and time as the forms under which we know objects; but he departs from Kant in holding that these forms are also modes of things as actually existing. It would therefore appear that the fact of their being (as Hamilton calls them) *à priori* 'forms of thought' does not interfere with the objective truth of our spatio-temporal knowledge; it is a knowledge, under the forms of space and time, of things which really

<sup>1</sup> Reid's *Works*, ed. Hamilton, Note D\*, pp. 881, 882.

exist in space and time. Hamilton's doctrine of immediate perception necessitates some such view. He saw, moreover, that some kind of reconciliation was required ; but a parenthetical paragraph in his article on 'the Philosophy of Perception' exhausts what he has to say on this important problem. 'To obviate misapprehension,' he asserts that all that we know is 'those phases of being which stand in analogy to our faculties of knowledge.' This vague phrase may mean little more than that we cannot know what we are incapable of knowing. Because the nature of a thing is 'in analogy to our faculties' may be the reason why we are able to know it ; it cannot show that we do not know it as it is or in its actual nature. But Hamilton's mind seemed to work in two distinct compartments belonging respectively to the philosophy of perception and to the philosophy of the conditioned. The two lines of thought seldom met, and when they did meet the result was sometimes curious. *Rerumque ignarus, imagine gaudet* is the taunt he flings at Brown and the representationists ; but when he poses as the philosopher of the conditioned, he takes the same tag as his own motto—*rerumque ignarus, imagine gaudet*.

As regards our supposed knowledge of the absolute or of the infinite, that, he holds, is merely a negative conception. On this topic he can hardly be said to have set forth anything substantially new, though his arguments were novel and striking to the English reader of the day. Nor, even here, on this fundamental point, can his view be said to be free from ambiguity. His doctrine seems to lead logically to a form of positivism ; he will not even allow that the moral consciousness or 'practical reason' has the significance assigned to it by Kant ; but yet he asserts emphatically that what cannot be known can be and ought to be believed. What then is belief ? By classifying it as a form or 'faculty' of cognition, Hamilton strikes at the root of his doctrine that thought excludes the notion of the absolute or infinite. When on the war-path against the unconditioned, the 'imbecility' of human knowledge is asserted to the fullest extent ; when religious belief is in question, the 'unknown God' is represented as somehow the object of consciousness ; and sometimes it would even appear as if his view were simply that knowledge of the highest object which consciousness can apprehend, cannot, like our knowledge of particular things, imply a reference to some higher concept.

The theological results of the philosophy of the conditioned were worked out thoroughly and with effective logic by Henry



Longueville Mansel, an Oxford professor who was dean of St Paul's for the three years preceding his death in 1871. Mansel was a scholar of less miscellaneous learning than Hamilton, and his thinking was less original; but his thought was not obscured by his learning. In the notes and appendixes to his edition of Aldrich's *Artis Logicæ Rudimenta* (1849), and in his *Prolegomena Logica* (1851), he defined and defended a formal view of the science similar to Hamilton's. His *Metaphysics* (1860), originally contributed to *The Encyclopædia Britannica*, is the best connected exposition of the philosophy that may be called Hamiltonian; and, in his *Philosophy of the Conditioned* (1866), the doctrine was defended against the criticisms of Mill. He was also the author of a brilliant brochure, in the form of an Aristophanic comedy, entitled *Phrontisterion* (republished in *Letters, Lectures and Reviews*, 1873), in which academic reformers and German philosophers are satirised. But his wider fame came from his Bampton lectures, *The Limits of Religious Thought* (1858). This work is a Christian apologetic founded on the doctrine of agnosticism (to use the modern term) which he shared with Hamilton. Since knowledge of God, in His absolute existence, is self-contradictory, since 'absolute morality' is equally beyond human knowledge and since our moral conceptions can only be 'relative and phenomenal,' he seeks to disallow any criticisms of the theological doctrine which are based upon human conceptions of good and evil. The indignation with which this doctrine was repudiated by John Stuart Mill formed one of the most striking, but not one of the most important, features of his criticism of the philosophy of Hamilton.

#### IV. JOHN STUART MILL AND OTHERS

John Stuart Mill is, on the whole, the most interesting and characteristic figure in English philosophy in the nineteenth century. He was successively the hope and the leader, sometimes, also, the despair, of the school of thought which was regarded as representative of English traditions. He was born in London on 20 May 1806, and was the eldest son of James Mill. He was educated entirely by his father and was deliberately shielded from association with other boys of his age. From his earliest years he was subjected to a rigid system of intellectual discipline. As a result of this system, knowledge of what are considered the higher branches of education was acquired by him in childhood, and he

started on his career, according to his own account, with an advantage of a quarter of a century over his contemporaries. This is probably an overstatement of a very remarkable intellectual precocity; and John Mill recognised, in later life, that his father's system had the fault of appealing to the intellect only and that the culture of his practical and emotional life had been neglected, while his physical health was probably undermined by the strenuous labour exacted from him. James Mill's method seems to have been designed to make his son's mind a first-rate thinking machine, so that the boy might become a prophet of the utilitarian gospel. In this he succeeded. But the interest—one may almost say, the tragedy—of the son's life arose from the fact that he possessed a much finer and subtler nature than his father's—a mind which could not be entirely satisfied by the hereditary creed. He remained more or less orthodox, according to the standards of his school; but he welcomed light from other quarters, and there were times when Grote and others feared that he might become a castaway. 'A new mystic' was Carlyle's judgment upon some of his early articles. Mill never became a mystic; but he kept an open mind, and he saw elements of truth in ideas in which the stricter utilitarians could see nothing at all.

He had no doubts at the outset of his career. On reading Bentham (this was when he was fifteen or sixteen) the feeling rushed upon him 'that all previous moralists were superseded.' The principle of utility, he says, understood and applied as it was by Bentham,

gave unity to my conception of things. I now had opinions; a creed, a doctrine, a philosophy; in one among the best senses of the word, a religion; the inculcation and diffusion of which could be made the principal outward purpose of a life.

Soon afterwards he formed a small 'Utilitarian Society,' and, for some few years, he was one of 'a little knot of young men' who adopted his father's philosophical and political views 'with youthful fanaticism.' A position under his father in the India office had secured him against the misfortune of having to depend on literary work for his livelihood; and he found that office-work left him ample leisure for the pursuit of his wider interests.

He was already coming to be looked upon as a leader of thought when, in his twenty-first year, the mental crisis occurred which is described in his *Autobiography*. This crisis was a result of the severe strain, physical and mental, to which he had been subjected from his earliest years. He was 'in a dull state of

nerves'; the objects in life for which he had been trained and for which he had worked lost their charm; he had 'no delight in virtue, or the general good, but also just as little in anything else'; a constant habit of analysis had dried up the fountains of feeling within him. After many months of despair, he found, accidentally, that the capacity for emotion was not dead, and 'the cloud gradually drew off.' But the experience he had undergone modified his theory of life and his character. Happiness was still to be the end of life, but it should not be taken as its direct end; 'ask yourself whether you are happy, and you cease to be so. The only chance is to treat, not happiness, but some end external to it, as the purpose of life.' Further, he ceased to attach almost exclusive importance to the ordering of outward circumstances, and, 'for the first time, gave its proper place, among the prime necessities of human well-being, to the internal culture of the individual.' In this state of mind, he found, in the poems of Wordsworth—'the poet of unpoetical natures,' as he calls him—that very culture of the feelings which he was seeking. From him he learned 'what would be the perennial sources of happiness, when all the greater evils of life shall have been removed.'

Mill's widened intellectual sympathies were shown by his reviews of Tennyson's poems and of Carlyle's *French Revolution* in 1835 and 1837. The articles on Bentham and on Coleridge, published in 1838 and 1840 respectively, disclose his modified philosophical outlook and the exact measure of his new mental independence. From the position now occupied he did not seriously depart throughout the strenuous literary work of his mature years. The influence of the new spirit, which he identified with the thinking of Coleridge, did not noticeably develop further; if anything, perhaps, his later writings adhered more nearly to the traditional views than might have been anticipated from some indications in his early articles.

These two articles provide the key for understanding Mill's own thought. He looks upon Bentham as a great constructive genius who had first brought light and system into regions formerly chaotic. No finer or juster appreciation of Bentham's work has ever been written. Mill agrees with Bentham's fundamental principle and approves his method. Bentham made morals and politics scientific; but his knowledge of life was limited. 'It is wholly empirical and the empiricism of one who has had little experience.' The deeper things of life did not touch him; all the subtler workings of mind and its environment were hidden from his view. It

is significant that Mill assumes that, for light on these deeper and subtler aspects of life, we must go not to other writers of the empirical tradition but to thinkers of an entirely different school. He disagrees with the latter fundamentally in the systematic presentation of their views—whether these be defended by the easy appeal to intuition or by the more elaborate methods of Schelling or Hegel. What we really get from them are half-lights—glimpses, often fitful and always imperfect, into aspects of truth not seen at all by their opponents. Coleridge represented this type of thought. He had not Bentham's great constructive faculties; but he had insight in regions where Bentham's vision failed, and he appreciated, what Bentham almost entirely overlooked, the significance of historical tradition.

The ideas which Mill derived from the writings of Coleridge, or from his association with younger men who had been influenced by Coleridge, did not bring about any fundamental change in his philosophical standpoint, but they widened his horizon. And in nearly all his books we can trace their effect. He seems conscious that the analysis which satisfied other followers of Bentham is imperfect, and that difficulties remain which they are unable to solve and cannot even see.

Mill's *System of Logic* was published in 1843, and ran through many editions, some of which—especially the third (1850) and the eighth (1872)—were thoroughly revised and supplemented by the incorporation of new, mainly controversial, matter. It is probably the greatest of his books. In spite of Hobbes's treatise, and of the suggestive discussions in the third book of Locke's *Essay*, the greater English philosophers almost seem to have conspired to neglect the theory of logic. It had kept its place as an academic study, but on traditional lines; Aristotle was supposed to have said the last word on it, and that last word to be enshrined in scholastic manuals. English thought, however, was beginning to emerge from this stage. Richard Whately had written a textbook, *Elements of Logic* (1826), which, by its practical method and modern illustrations, gave a considerable impetus to the study, and Hamilton's more comprehensive researches had begun. From them Mill did not learn much or anything. What he set himself to work out was a theory of evidence in harmony with the first principles of the empirical philosophy; and this was an almost untouched problem. He may have obtained help from Locke; he acknowledges the value for his thinking of Dugald Stewart's analysis of the process of reasoning; he was still more indebted to

his discussions with a society of friends. Thus he worked out his theory of terms, propositions and the syllogism; and then the book was laid aside for five years. When he returned to it, and proceeded to analyse the inductive process, he found rich material to hand not only in Sir John Herschel's *Discourse on the Study of Natural Philosophy* (1830), but, also, in William Whewell's *History of the Inductive Sciences* (1837). After his theory of induction was substantially complete, he became acquainted with, and derived stimulus and assistance from, the first two volumes of Comte's *Cours de philosophie positive* (1830). These were the chief influences upon his work, and their enumeration serves to bring out the originality of his performance. His work marks an epoch in logical enquiry, not for English philosophy only but in modern thought.

The reputation of Mill's *Logic* was largely due to his analysis of inductive proof. He provided the empirical sciences with a set of formulae and criteria which might serve the same purpose for them as the time-worn formulae of the syllogism had served for arguments that proceeded from general principles. In this part of his work he derived important material from Whewell, much as he differed from him in general point of view, and he found his own methods implicitly recognised in Herschel's *Discourse*. The importance and originality of Mill's contribution, however, cannot be denied. His analysis is much more precise and complete than any that had been carried out by his immediate predecessors. He seeks to trace the steps by which we pass from statements about particular facts to general truths, and also to justify the transition: though he is more convincing in his psychological account of the process than in his logical justification of its validity. When he is brought face to face with the fundamental problem of knowledge, as Hume had been before him, he does not show Hume's clearness of thought.

Mill's work is not merely a logic in the limited sense of that term which had become customary in England. It is a theory of knowledge such as Locke and Hume attempted. The whole is rendered more precise by its definite reference to the question of proof or evidence; but the problem is Hume's problem over again. The ultimate elements of knowledge are subjective entities—'feelings or states of consciousness'—but knowledge has objective validity. The elements are distinct, though the laws of association bind them into groups and may even fuse them into inseparable wholes—but knowledge unites and distinguishes in an order which

is not that of laws of association. The theory of knowledge, accordingly, has to explain how our thinking, especially in the transition from assertion to assertion which we call 'proof,' has validity for objective reality, and, in doing so, it has to give a tenable account of the universal principles postulated in these transitions. In Mill's case, as in Hume's, this has to be done on the assumption that the immediate object in experience is something itself mental, and that there are no *à priori* principles determining the connections of objects. In his doctrine of terms and propositions, Mill emphasises the objective reference in knowledge, although he cannot be said to meet, or even fully to recognise, the difficulty of reconciling this view with his psychological analysis. He faces much more directly the problem of the universal element in knowledge. He contends that, ultimately, proof is always from particulars to particulars. The general proposition which stands as major premiss in a syllogism is only a shorthand record of a number of particular observations, which facilitates and tests the transition to the conclusion. All the general principles involved in thinking, even the mathematical axioms, are interpreted as arrived at in this way from experience: so that the assertion of their universal validity stands in need of justification.

In induction the essential inference is to new particulars, not to the general statement or law. And here he faces the crucial point for his theory. Induction, as he expounds it, is based upon the causal principle. Mill followed Hume in his analysis of cause. Now the sting of Hume's doctrine lay in its subjectivity—the reduction of the causal relation to a mental habit. Mill did not succeed in extracting the sting; he could only ignore it. Throughout, the relation of cause and effect is treated by him as something objective: not, indeed, as implying anything in the nature of power, but as signifying a certain constancy (which he, unwarrantably, describes as invariable) in the succession of phenomena. He never hesitates to speak of it as an objective characteristic of events, but without ever enquiring into its objective grounds. According to Mill, it is only when we are able to discover a causal connection among phenomena that strict inductive inference is possible either to a general law or to new empirical particulars. But the law of universal causation, on his view, is itself an inference from a number of particular cases. Thus it is established by inductive inference and yet, at the same time, all inductive inference depends upon it. Mill seeks to resolve the contradiction

by maintaining that this general truth, that is to say, the law of causation, is indeed itself arrived at by induction, but by a weaker form of induction, called *per enumerationem simplicem*, in which the causal law is not itself assumed. Such a bare catalogue of facts, not penetrating to the principle of their connection, would not, in ordinary cases, justify an inference that can be relied on. But Mill thinks that the variety of experience that supports it in this case, its constant verification by new experience and the probability that, had there been any exception to it, that exception would have come to light, justify our confidence in it as the ground of all the laws of nature. He does not recognise that these grounds for belief—whatever their value may be—all assume the postulate of uniformity which he is endeavouring to justify.

A later and more comprehensive discussion of his philosophical views, especially in a psychological regard, is given in his *Examination of Sir William Hamilton's Philosophy and of the principal philosophical questions discussed in his writings*. This work was published in 1865; and, as his habit was, the author amplified it greatly in subsequent editions by replies to his critics. In this case the criticisms were exceptionally numerous. The book focused the whole controversial energy of the period belonging to the two opposed schools, the intuitionist and the empirical; and, in spite of its controversial character, it became the leading text-book of that psychological philosophy which had been adumbrated by Hume. It is a work which shows Mill's powers at their most mature stage. He criticises with severity the theory which he sets out to examine; but he is alive to the awkward places in his own position. Among the numerous doctrines on which he left the impress of his workmanship, none excited more attention at the time of the book's publication, or are of greater permanent importance, than his doctrines of the external world and of the self. There is nothing fundamentally original about his views on these topics; but his discussion of both illustrates his ability to see further into the facts than his predecessors, and his candour in recording what he sees, along, however, with a certain disinclination to pursue an enquiry which might land him definitely on the other side of the traditional lines. Mill's doctrine is essentially Humean, though, as regards the external world, he prefers to call it Berkeleyan; and here he is the inventor of a phrase: matter is 'permanent possibility of sensation.' The phrase is striking and useful; but a possibility of sensation is not sensation, and the permanence which

he attributes to the possibility of sensation implies an objective order: so that the reduction of matter to sensation is implicitly relinquished when it appears to be affirmed in words. Mind, in somewhat similar fashion, is reduced to a succession of feelings or states of consciousness. But the fact of memory proves a stumbling-block in his way; he cannot explain how a succession of feelings should be conscious of itself as a succession; and he implicitly admits the need of a principle of unity. Thus, he almost relinquishes his own theory and only avoids doing so explicitly by falling back on the assertion that here we are in presence of the final inexplicability in which ultimate questions always merge.

In spite of the prominence of the ethical interest in his mind and in spite, also, of numerous ethical discussions in his other writings, Mill's sole contribution to the fundamental problem of ethical theory was his small volume *Utilitarianism*, which first appeared in *Fraser's Magazine* in 1861 and was reprinted in book-form in 1863. Perhaps, he regarded the fundamental positions of Benthamism as too secure to need much elaboration. What he offers is a finely conceived and finely written defence of utilitarian ethics, into which his own modifications of Bentham's doctrine of life are worked. He holds that the sanctions of this doctrine are not weaker than those of any other doctrine, and that, in its own nature, it is neither a selfish nor a sensual theory. It is not selfish, because it regards the pleasures of all men as of equal moment; it is not sensual, because it recognises the superior value of intellectual, artistic and social pleasures as compared with those of the senses. But Mill fails in trying to establish a logical connection between the universal reference of the ethical doctrine and the egoistic analysis of individual action to which his psychology committed him. And he is so determined to emphasise the superiority of the pleasures commonly called 'higher,' that he maintains that, merely as pleasures, they are superior in kind to the pleasures of the senses, irrespective of any excess of the latter in respect of quantity. In so doing he strikes at the root of hedonism, for he makes the ultimate criterion of value reside not in pleasure itself but in that characteristic—whatever it may turn out to be—which makes one kind of pleasure superior to another.

Mill's social and political writings, in addition to occasional articles, consist of the short treatise *Considerations on Representative Government* (1860), *Thoughts on Parliamentary Reform* (1859), the essays *On Liberty* (1859) and *On the Subjection of Women* (1869), *Essays on some Unsettled Questions of Political*



*Economy* (1831, 1844) and *Principles of Political Economy* (1848). The method appropriate to these topics had been already discussed in the chapters on 'the Logic of the Moral Sciences' included in his *Logic*. He sought a *via media* between the purely empirical method and the deductive method. The latter, as employed by his father, was modelled on the reasonings of geometry, which is not a science of causation. The method of politics, if it is to be deductive, must belong to a different type, and will (he holds) be the same as that used in mathematical physics. Dynamics is a deductive science because the law of the composition of forces holds; similarly, politics is a deductive science because the causes with which it deals follow this law: the effects of these causes, when conjoined, are the same as the sum of the effects which the same causes produce when acting separately. Like his predecessors, Mill postulated certain forces as determining human conduct: especially, self-interest and mental association. From their working he deduced political and social consequences. He did not diverge from the principles agreed upon by those with whom he was associated. Perhaps, he did not add very much to them. But he saw their limitations more clearly than others did: the hypothetical nature of economic theory, and the danger that democratic government might prove antagonistic to the causes of individual freedom and of the common welfare. To guard against these dangers he proposed certain modifications of the representative system. But his contemporaries, and even his successors of the same way of thinking in general, for long looked upon the dangers as imaginary, and his proposals for their removal were ignored. The essay *On Liberty*—the most popular of all his works—is an eloquent defence of the thesis 'that the sole end for which mankind are warranted, individually or collectively, in interfering with the liberty of action of any of their number, is self-protection,' but, as an argument, it meets everywhere with the difficulty of determining the precise point at which the distinction between self-regarding and social (even directly social) activity is to be drawn. Sir James Fitzjames Stephen, accepting Mill's utilitarian criterion, raked his positions with a fire of brilliant and incisive, if unsympathetic, criticism in *Liberty, Equality, Fraternity* (1873).

Mill's *Political Economy* has been variously regarded as an improved Adam Smith and as a popularised Ricardo. Perhaps the latter description is nearer the mark. Its essential doctrines differ little, if at all, from those of Ricardo; the theory of the 'wages fund,' for example, is formulated quite in the spirit of

Ricardo, though this theory was afterwards relinquished or modified by Mill in consequence of the criticisms of William Thomas Thornton. But the work has a breadth of treatment which sometimes reminds one of Adam Smith: the hypothetical nature of economic theory was not overlooked, and the 'applications to social philosophy' were kept in view. In spite of his adherence to the maxim of *laissez faire*, Mill recognised the possibility of modifying the system of distribution, and, with regard to that system, he displayed a leaning to the socialist ideal, which grew stronger as his life advanced. His methodical and thorough treatment of economics made his work a text-book for more than a generation, and largely determined the scope of most of the treatises of his own and the succeeding period, even of those written by independent thinkers.

Mill died at Avignon in 1873. After his death, were published his *Autobiography* (1873) and *Three Essays on Religion: Nature the Utility of Religion and Theism* (1874). These essays were written between 1850 and 1870 and include the author's latest thoughts on ultimate questions. He had been educated in the belief that speculation on ultimate questions is futile; in his works he had always maintained the attitude afterwards called agnosticism, for which he was willing to adopt Comte's term positivism; he accepted, also, in general, Comte's doctrine on this point, though always dissociating himself from the latter's political and social theories. But, even while, in his book *Auguste Comte and Positivism* (1865), accepting the view that the essential nature and ultimate causes of things are inscrutable, he holds that this 'positive mode of thought is not necessarily a denial of the supernatural,' but only throws it back beyond the limits of science. His posthumous essays show a further development. In that on nature (the earliest of the series), he dwells upon the imperfections of the cosmic order as showing that it cannot have been the creation of a being of infinite goodness and power; in the last essay of the volume, he approaches a tentative and limited form of theism—the doctrine of a finite God.

For more than a generation Mill's influence was dominant in all departments of philosophical and political thought; he had the initiative, and set the problems for his opponents as well as for his adherents; and his works became university text-books. This holds of politics, economics, ethics, psychology and logic. A striking reaction against his influence is shown in the work of

William Stanley Jevons, professor at Manchester and afterwards in London, whose economic and logical writings are distinguished by important original ideas. In his *Theory of Political Economy* (1871), he introduced the conception of final (or marginal) utility, which, subsequently, has been greatly developed in the analytic and mathematical treatment of the subject. In logic, also, he laid the foundations for a mathematical treatment in his *Pure Logic* (1864) and *Substitution of Similars* (1869); and, in his *Principles of Science* (1874), he fully elaborated his theory of scientific inference, a theory which diverged widely from the theory of induction expounded by Mill. As time went on, Jevons became more and more critical of the foundations of Mill's empirical philosophy, which he attacked unsparingly in discussions contributed to *Mind*.

George Grote, the historian of Greece, an older contemporary and early associate of Mill, deserves mention here not only for his works on the philosophies of Plato and Aristotle, but, also, for some independent contributions to ethics, published together under the title *Fragments on Ethical Subjects* (1876). He had little sympathy with Mill's approximations to types of thought opposed to the traditional utilitarianism. In this respect he agreed with Alexander Bain, professor at Aberdeen, a writer of far greater importance in a philosophical regard. Bain was younger than Mill and long outlived him; he assisted him in some of his works, especially the *Logic*; he wrote numerous works himself; but his pre-eminence was in psychology, to which his chief contributions were two elaborate books, *The Senses and the Intellect* (1855) and *The Emotions and the Will* (1859). The psychology of James Mill and of J. S. Mill was, in the main, derived from Hartley; but it was Hartley as expurgated by Priestley, Hartley with the physiology left out<sup>1</sup>. Bain reinstated the physiological factor, not in Hartley's rather speculative manner, but by introducing facts of nerve and muscle whenever they could serve to elucidate mental process. That came to be, as a rule, whenever the mental process itself was obscure or difficult. The result is sometimes confusing, because it mixes two different orders of scientific conceptions. But Bain's work is wonderfully complete as a treatment of the principle of the association of ideas; and, perhaps, he has said the last word that can be said in favour of this principle as the ultimate explanation of mind. His range of vision may have been narrow, but he had a keen eye for everything within that range. He was persistent in his search for facts and shrewd in

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *ante*, p. 5.

examining them; and he had no illusions—except the great illusion that mind is a bundle of sensations tied together by laws of association. It is interesting to note how this clear-sighted and unimaginative writer made observations which suggest doctrines, different from his own, which have gained prominence later. His observations on spontaneous movement and his teaching as to fixed ideas strike at the roots of the analysis of volition to which he adhered, and might lead naturally to a view of mind as essentially active and no mere grouping of sensations or feelings. He offered, also, a new analysis of belief (though he subsequently withdrew it) which resolved it into a preparedness to act; and, here, the latent ‘activism’ in his thinking might have led, if developed, to something of the nature of pragmatism.

George Croom Robertson, professor in University college, London, was in general sympathy with Mill’s school of thought, tempered, however, by wide knowledge and appreciation of other developments, including those of recent philosophy. Circumstances prevented his producing much literary work beyond a few articles and an admirable monograph on Hobbes (1886). He is remembered not only for these, and for his lectures, some of which have been published (1896), but, also, for his skilful and successful work as editor of *Mind* during the first sixteen years of its existence. *Mind* was the first English journal devoted to psychology and philosophy, and its origin in 1876 is a landmark in the history of British philosophy.

In Mill’s day and afterwards there was an active, though not very widespread, propaganda of the positive philosophy of Comte. The study of Comte’s system was greatly facilitated by the admirable condensed translation of his *Positive Philosophy* issued by Harriet Martineau in 1853. The chief teachers of positivist doctrine in England were a group of writers who had been contemporaries at Oxford; but a serious disagreement arose amongst them regarding the prominence to be given to the inculcation of Comte’s ‘religion of humanity.’ Their activity was shown in lectures and addresses and in many translations of Comte’s works. *The Catechism of positive religion* was translated by Richard Congreve in 1858; *Comte’s General View of Positivism* by John Henry Bridges in 1865; and *System of Positive Polity* by Bridges and Frederick Harrison in 1875. Their independent writings were inspired by the positivist spirit, even when they did not add much to its defence on philosophical grounds. In *The Unity of Comte’s Life*

and *Doctrine* (1866), Bridges replied to the criticisms of J. S. Mill. He published, also, *Five Discourses on Positive Religion* in 1882; and his *Essays and Addresses* (1907) were collected and edited after his death.

## V. RATIONAL AND RELIGIOUS PHILOSOPHERS

Although Mill's fame overshadowed the other philosophers of his day, there were a number of contemporary writers who were not merely his followers or critics, but independent thinkers. Of note among these was John Grote, younger brother of the historian, who held the chair of moral philosophy at Cambridge from 1855 to 1866. Grote himself issued only one volume on philosophy—*Exploratio Philosophica*, Part I (1865). After his death three volumes were compiled from his manuscripts: *An Examination of the Utilitarian Philosophy* in 1870, *A Treatise on the Moral Ideals* in 1876 and the second part of *Exploratio* in 1900. They are all 'rough notes'—as the author himself describes the first on its title-page. They have no place in literature. Grote thought and wrote simply to get at the truth of things and without any view of impressing the public. A 'belief in thought' upheld him: 'a feeling that things were worth thinking about, that thought was worth effort.' He did not seek reputation as a philosophical writer, and he has not gained it. His direct influence has been restricted to a limited number of other thinkers, through whom it has passed to wider circles without any definite trace of its origin. His books are largely filled with criticism of contemporary writers. But none of the criticism is merely destructive: it aims always at elucidating the core of truth in other men's opinions, with a view to a comprehensive synthesis. Often it leads to bringing out important doctrines which, if not altogether new, are set in a new light. An instance of this is his whole doctrine of 'the scale of sensation or knowledge,' and, in particular, the elaboration and application of the distinction of two kinds of knowledge or, rather, the twofold process of knowledge, which he formulated as the distinction between *acquaintance with* a thing and *knowing about* it. He sought to assign its due value to phenomenalism or positivism, at the same time as he contended for the more complete view—'rational' or idealist—which recognised in positivism 'an abstraction from the complete view of knowledge.' Similarly, in moral philosophy, there was a science of virtue, or 'aretaics,

existing side by side with 'eudaemonics,' or the science of happiness. Fundamentally, his theory is a doctrine of thought: 'the fact that *we know* is prior to, and logically more comprehensive than, the fact that what we know *is*.' To be known, things must be knowable, or fitted for knowledge. 'Knowledge is the sympathy of intelligence with intelligence, through the medium of qualified or particular existence.'

Religious philosophy in England was stimulated and advanced by the work of three men all born between 1801 and 1805. These were Maurice, Newman and Martineau. Frederick Denison Maurice<sup>1</sup> had already an ecclesiastical career behind him when, in 1866, he succeeded Grote as professor at Cambridge. Of his numerous works only a few deal with philosophy; the most important of these, *Moral and Metaphysical Philosophy*, originally appeared in the *Encyclopaedia Metropolitana* in 1847 and is a historical sketch which is chiefly devoted to ancient thought. Maurice's influence was due to his personality more than to his books; and he was a social reformer and religious teacher rather than a philosopher. But his work, both in social reform and in religion, derived stimulus and direction from philosophical ideas. John Henry Newman<sup>2</sup> was still less of a philosopher, though his *Grammar of Assent* propounds a theory of the nature and grounds of belief. More significant, however, is the appearance in Newman's work of the idea of development, which was beginning to transform all departments of thought: for the quasi-mechanical view with which he started of a fixed norm of belief existing in the past, he substituted the view of the church as an organism whose life and doctrine were in process of growth. The only philosopher among those who joined the Roman church about the same time as Newman was William George Ward, who, in various articles, carried on a controversy with Mill concerning free-will and necessary truth. These and other articles were collected after his death and published as *Essays on the Philosophy of Theism* (1884).

Of much greater importance than these, in a philosophical regard, was James Martineau. His philosophy, also, was essentially religious philosophy; individual freedom and the being and presence of God were his fundamental certainties, and these he defended in many writings during his long life. His earlier works were mainly religious rather than philosophical, though, in a series

<sup>1</sup> See, *ante*, vol. XII, chap. XIII.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* chap. XII.

of essays, he showed his power as a critic of materialism and naturalism, and gave an outline of the ethical views which he afterwards worked out in detail. He was eighty years old, or upwards, when his chief books appeared—*Types of Ethical Theory* (1885), *A Study of Religion* (1888), and *The Seat of Authority in Religion* (1890). The first of these is the most notable, and works out the original view of the moral criterion which had been previously indicated by him. It suffers from faulty arrangement, from the undue prominence given to the psychological factor in moral judgment and from the incompleteness of the psychological analysis. As a whole it does not impress the reader. But, taken in detail, it is seen to be full of penetrating criticism, and to be inspired by insight into the spiritual meaning of life. Traces of age are to be found only in its defective order and, perhaps, in its diffuseness; its style shows no marks of weariness: it is brilliant, pellucid, eloquent, rhetorical sometimes and coloured by emotion, but never falls below the dignity of his theme. Martineau did not make any important advance in speculative construction; he was not in sympathy with the idealist metaphysic that had risen to the ascendant in England even before his books were published; the ideas which he elucidated and defended were those which had been distinctive of spiritual thought for many centuries. In his criticisms, on the other hand, he did not restrict himself to the older forms of materialist and sensationalist doctrine; he was prompt to recognise the difference made by more recent scientific views, and he showed no lack of power or effectiveness in dealing with the claims of the philosophy of evolution.

## VI. HERBERT SPENCER AND THE PHILOSOPHY OF EVOLUTION

The publication of Darwin's *Origin of Species* in 1859 marks a turning-point in the history of thought. It had a revolutionary effect upon the view of the world held by educated men similar to that which had been produced, more slowly, three centuries before, by the work of Copernicus; on philosophical ideas its influence may, perhaps, be better compared with that of the theory of mechanics chiefly due to Galileo. The latter contributed to philosophy the conception of nature as a mechanical system; Darwin contributed the conception of evolution and, owing largely to his influence, biological ideas gained greater prominence than mathematical in philosophical construction.

The acknowledged leader of the new movement in philosophy was Herbert Spencer. He was born at Derby on 27 April 1820, and his early training was as an engineer. This profession he relinquished at the age of twenty-five. He had previously, in 1842, contributed a series of letters on 'the Proper Sphere of Government' to *The Nonconformist*, and, from 1848 to 1853 he acted as sub-editor of *The Economist*. In these years he wrote his book *Social Statics* (1850) and began the publication of longer essays in reviews, among which mention should be made of the essays 'The Development Hypothesis' (1852), 'The Genesis of Science' (1854) and 'Progress: its law and cause' (1857). He also published *Principles of Psychology*, in one volume, in 1855. His essays show, even by their titles, that he was working towards a theory of evolution before he had any knowledge of Darwin's researches, the results of which were still unpublished. Then, in 1860, he issued his 'Programme of a System of Synthetic Philosophy,' on which he had been at work for some time, and to the elaboration of which he devoted his life. It is impossible to speak too highly of the single-minded purpose with which he carried out this task, in spite of inherent and extraneous difficulties. He continued to work, without haste and without rest, publishing *First Principles* in 1862, *Principles of Biology* (two volumes) in 1864—7, *Principles of Psychology* (two volumes) in 1870—2, *Principles of Sociology* (three volumes) in 1876—96 and *Principles of Ethics* (two volumes) in 1879—92. Besides these he designed a series of charts of *Descriptive Sociology*, which were compiled by his assistants, until the work had to be suspended from lack of funds; and he also produced smaller works on *Education* (1861), *The Classification of the Sciences* (1864), *The Study of Sociology* (1872), *The Man versus The State* (1884) and *Factors of Organic Evolution* (1887). Thus, his perseverance enabled him to complete his scheme: except, indeed, that he omitted the detailed treatment of inorganic evolution, and thus gained the incidental advantage of avoiding the awkward problem of the origin of life. And he produced a considerable amount of subsidiary writing, including an *Autobiography* (published in 1904, the year after his death), which contains a minute and elaborate account of his life, character and work.

Spencer's idea of philosophy is a system of completely coordinated knowledge—the sciences consisting of knowledge partially coordinated. In this sense his system is synthetic. It



is a scheme in which everything is to find its place, and is to be seen as a resultant of a single principle. His elaboration of this scheme approaches completeness, and, in this respect, his system stands by itself: no other English thinker since Bacon and Hobbes had even attempted anything so vast. The system itself fitted in admirably, also, with the scientific conceptions of the early Darwinians, and thus obtained wide currency in all English-speaking countries and, to a less extent, on the continent of Europe. Darwin hailed him as 'our great philosopher,' for he made evolution a universal solvent and not merely a means for explaining the different forms of plants and animals. At the same time, the support which it received from modern science seemed to give Spencer's philosophy a more secure position than that of those speculative systems of which the English mind tended to be suspicious.

The view of philosophy as science further coordinated brings Spencer's doctrine into line with positivism. He did not, however, entirely ignore the question of the nature of ultimate reality. Perhaps, he was not much interested in questions of the kind, and he had certainly small acquaintance with previous speculation regarding them. But he had great skill in adapting current doctrines to his uses; and he found what he needed in the doctrine of the relativity of knowledge set forth by Hamilton and Mansel. On this he based his doctrine of the limits of knowledge. But he found, as others have found, that it was necessary to recognise something which lay beyond the sphere of exact knowledge. Hamilton had called this the sphere of belief; Spencer says that we have an indefinite consciousness of what he nevertheless calls the unknowable. The nature of this indefinite consciousness is not explained by him; yet, its object is not treated by him, as one would expect it to be, as a mere blank; it is said to be 'growing clearer'; the unknowable is constantly referred to as a power, and it is even asserted that it makes for the happiness of mankind. These inconsistencies soften his paradox that religion and science can be reconciled by assigning to the latter the region of the knowable and restricting the former to the unknowable. On his view, all that we know consists of manifestations of the inscrutable power behind phenomena; and these manifestations depend ultimately upon a single first principle—the persistence of force. Spencer's interpretation of this principle is somewhat flexible and has been attacked by mathematicians and physicists as loose and unscientific. Nevertheless,

Spencer holds that from it every other scientific principle must be deduced—even the law of evolution itself. He has provided a 'formula,' or, rather, definition, of evolution. He defines it as

an integration of matter and concomitant dissipation of motion; during which the matter passes from an indefinite incoherent homogeneity to a definite coherent heterogeneity; and during which the retained motion undergoes a parallel transformation.

All phenomena of whatever kind are subject to this law. It is throughout conceived as a law of progress, which will issue in a highest state establishing 'the extremest multiformity and most complete moving equilibrium.' But this stage, also, cannot be permanent; and Spencer contemplates the history of the universe as a succession of cycles—'alternate eras of evolution and dissolution.'

Spencer displayed much ingenuity in fitting organic, mental and social facts into this mechanical framework. His early training as an engineer seems to have influenced his ideas. He built a system as he might have built a bridge. It was a problem of strains and of the adaptation of material. Regarded thus, the whole problem was mechanical and had to be solved in terms of matter and motion. His purpose was, as he says, 'to interpret the phenomena of life, mind, and society in terms of matter, motion, and force.' Hence, life, mind and society are treated as stages of increasing complexity in phenomena of the same kind, and—so far as this treatment is adhered to—the characteristic functions of each stage are left unexplained. But the method of treatment is supplemented by another in which the facts are dealt with more directly. This is seen especially in psychology, where the 'subjective aspect' is recognised with only a suggestion of an attempt to deduce it from the objective aspect. Spencer was a keen observer and fertile in his reflections on what he observed. His power of coordinating facts may, perhaps, be seen at its best in his *Psychology* and *Sociology*. His generalisations may be often unsound; but, if we compare these works with earlier and then with later treatises on the same subjects, it is not possible to deny the great stimulus to thought which they gave.

Spencer himself set the greatest store upon his work on ethics. To it, he said, all his other work led up; and this induced him to issue the first part of it—called *The Data of Ethics*—out of due order and before his *Sociology* was completed. The first part is undoubtedly the most instructive section of the book as ultimately

finished. The facts of morality are regarded as belonging to the same order of evolution as the facts dealt with in previous volumes, being only more special and complicated; full consideration is given to their biological, sociological and psychological aspects; the respective rights of egoism and of altruism are defended; and the ethics of evolution is distinguished from the utilitarian ethics not by having some other ultimate end than happiness but by its different method and working criterion. Where the author fails is in giving any adequate proof for his assumption that evolution tends to greatest happiness—an assumption upon which his ethical theory depends. And, like all the exponents of the ethics of evolution who have followed him, he does not distinguish clearly between the historical process explained by the law of evolution and the ground of its authority for conduct—if such authority be claimed for it. He finds the standard for right conduct in what he calls ‘absolute ethics,’ by which he means a description of the conduct of fully-evolved man in fully-evolved surroundings. In this state, there will be complete adaptation between the individual and his environment; so that, even if action is still possible, no choice of better or worse will remain. The system of absolute ethics is worked out in the succeeding parts of the work, but with very meagre success. Indeed, at the end, the author is fain to admit that evolution had not helped him to the extent he had anticipated.

In his ethical, and still more in his political, writings we see the supreme value set by Spencer on the individual, and the very restricted functions which he allowed to the state or other organised community of individuals. The point is not, perhaps, easy to reconcile with the doctrine of evolution as otherwise expounded by him. But there were two things which seem to have been more fundamental in his thought than evolution itself. One of these has been already referred to as the group of ideas which may be described as mechanism and which is exhibited both in the basis and in the plan of his whole structure. The other is his strong bias towards individualism. If the former may plausibly be connected with his training as an engineer, the origin of the latter may, with still greater probability, be traced to the doctrines current in that circle of liberalism in which he was nurtured. He wrote political essays and a political treatise (*Social Statics*) before his mind seems to have been attracted by the conception of evolution; and, although, in some points, he afterwards modified the teaching of that treatise, its essential

ideas and its spirit characterise his latest writings on political theory. It showed ingenuity rather than insight on his part to bring them within the grasp of the evolution doctrine ; but, in spite of many criticisms, he held steadfastly to his doctrine of what has been called 'administrative nihilism.'

No other writer rivalled Spencer's attempt at a reconstruction of the whole range of human thought. But many of his contemporaries preceded or followed him in applying the new doctrine of evolution to the problems of life, mind and society. Some of these were men of science, who felt that an instrument had been put into their hands for extending its frontiers ; others were primarily interested in moral and political questions, or in philosophy generally, and evolution seemed to provide them with a key to old difficulties and a new view of the unity of reality. Darwin himself, though he never posed as a philosopher, was aware of the revolutionary effect which his researches had upon men's views of the universe as a whole ; what was more important, he made a number of shrewd and suggestive observations on morals and on psychology in his *Descent of Man* and, also, in his later volume *The Expression of the Emotions*. But his contributions were only incidental to his biological work. Others, writing under the intellectual influence which he originated, were concerned more directly with problems of philosophy.

Among these writers the first place may be given to George Henry Lewes, although, in his earlier works, he was influenced by Comte, not by Darwin. Lewes was a man of marvellous literary versatility as essayist, novelist, biographer and expositor of popular science. This versatility also marks his work in philosophy. At first Comte's influence was supreme. His philosophical publications began with *The Biographical History of Philosophy* (1845—6), a slight and inaccurate attempt to cover a vast field, and apparently designed to show that the field was not worth the tillage ; later editions of this work, however, not only greatly increased its extent and removed many blemishes but showed the author's ability to appreciate other points of view than that from which he had started. After an interval, he produced books entitled *Comte's Philosophy of the Sciences* (1853) and *Aristotle: a chapter from the history of science* (1864). But, for a long time, Lewes had been at work on investigations of a more constructive and original kind, partly philosophical and partly scientific, the results of which were not fully published at

the time of his death in 1878. These results were contained in *Problems of Life and Mind*, the first two volumes of which, entitled *The Foundations of a Creed*, appeared in 1874—5, and the fifth and final volume in 1879. In this work the author has advanced far from his early Comtism, and it shows, in many respects, a much more adequate comprehension of philosophical problems than can be found in Spencer, whose knowledge of the history of thought was limited and sketchy, and whose criticisms of other philosophers were nearly always external—in the worst sense of the word. But Lewes had fitted himself for writing, not only by original researches in physiology and related branches of science, but, also, by a considerable and sympathetic study of modern philosophy. He is thus able to appeal to other readers than those who have limited their intellectual enquiries to a predetermined range. He rejected as ‘metempirical’ what lay beyond possible experience; but he would not, like Spencer, affect to derive comfort from the unknowable. There was room for metaphysics, he thought, as the science of the highest generalities, or the codification of the most abstract laws of cause, and he sought to transform it by reducing it to the method of science. In working out this aim, he relied on and illustrated the distinction between immediate experience or ‘feeling’ and the symbols or conceptual constructions used for its codification. He also criticised the current mechanical interpretation of organic processes, holding that sensibility was inherent in nervous substance. And he was one of the first to emphasise the importance of the social factor in the development of mind and to exhibit its working. He defended the conception of the ‘general mind,’ not as expressing a separate entity, but as a symbol; and, for him, the individual mind, also, was a symbol. The problems with which he dealt were partly general—enquiries into knowledge, truth and certitude—partly psychophysical and psychological. His *Problems* shows the prolonged and eager reflection of an active mind. In it the multifarious writings of many years were reduced and expanded. But it may be doubted whether the reduction was carried far enough. There is a good deal of repetition, but hardly a central argument; the separate discussions are often important and suggestive; but the fundamental position regarding subject and object does not seem to be adequately defended or even made perfectly clear. Lewes had more philosophical insight than Spencer, but he had not the latter’s architectonic genius.

Thomas Henry Huxley, the distinguished zoologist and advocate of Darwinism, made many incursions into philosophy, and always with effect. From his youth he had studied its problems unsystematically; he had a way of going straight to the point in any discussion; and, judged by a literary standard, he was a great master of expository and argumentative prose. Apart from his special work in science, he had an important influence upon English thought through his numerous addresses and essays on topics of science, philosophy, religion and politics. Among the most important of his papers relevant here are those entitled 'The Physical Basis of Life' (1868), and 'On the Hypothesis that Animals are Automata' (1874), along with a monograph on Hume (1879) and the Romanes lecture *Ethics and Evolution* (1893). Huxley is credited with the invention of the term 'agnosticism' to describe his philosophical position: it expresses his attitude towards certain traditional questions without giving any clear delimitation of the frontiers of the knowable. He regards consciousness as a collateral effect of certain physical causes, and only an effect—never, also, a cause. But, on the other hand, he holds that matter is only a symbol, and that all physical phenomena can be analysed into states of consciousness. This leaves mental facts in the peculiar position of being collateral effects of something that, after all, is only a symbol for a mental fact; and the contradiction, or apparent contradiction, is left without remark. His contributions to ethics are still more remarkable. In a paper entitled 'Science and Morals' (1888), he concluded that the safety of morality lay 'in a real and living belief in that fixed order of nature which sends social disorganisation on the track of immorality.' His Romanes lecture reveals a different tone. In it, the moral order is contrasted with the cosmic order; evolution shows constant struggle; instead of looking to it for moral guidance, he 'repudiates the gladiatorial theory of existence.' He saw that the facts of historical process did not constitute validity for moral conduct; and his plain language compelled others to see it also. But he exaggerated the opposition between them and did not leave room for the influence of moral ideas as a factor in the historical process.

Another man of science, William Kingdon Clifford, professor of mathematics in London, dealt in occasional essays with some central points in the theory of knowledge, ethics and religion. In these essays he aimed at an interpretation of life in the light of the new science. There was insight as well as courage in all he wrote, and it was conveyed in a brilliant style. But his work was

cut short by his early death in 1879, and his contributions to philosophy remain suggestions only.

It was natural that men of science with a philosophical turn of mind should be among the first to work out the more general consequences of the theory of evolution. But the wide range which the theory might cover was fairly obvious, and was seen by others who approached philosophy from the point of view of studies other than the natural sciences. Foremost among these was Leslie Stephen, a man of letters keenly interested in the moral sciences. The portion of his writings which bear upon philosophy is small only in relation to his total literary output. His *History of English Thought in the Eighteenth Century* (1876) places the philosophers and moralists in their due position in the whole literary activity of the period, and is penetrating and usually just in its estimate of their work. A further stage of the same history—*The English Utilitarians* (1900)—was completed towards the end of his life. His own independent contribution is given in *The Science of Ethics* (1882). After Spencer's *Data*, this is the first book which worked out an ethical view determined by the theory of evolution. As such it is significant. The author had sat at the feet of John Stuart Mill; he had eagerly welcomed Darwin as an ally of the empirical and utilitarian creed; but he came to see that more extensive changes were necessary. Spencer's compromise between hedonism and evolutionism failed to satisfy him, and he found the ethical bearing of evolution better expressed by the conception of social vitality than by that of pleasure. The great merit of the work consists in its presentation of the social content of morality in the individual mind as well as in the community; but it does not sufficiently recognise the distinction between the historical process traced by the evolution theory and the ethical validity which evolution is assumed to possess.

The transformation of the biological sciences by the theory of evolution was connected with a wider movement, which consisted in the greatly extended use of the historical method in explaining the nature of things. This applies chiefly to the social sciences. It is to be remembered that both Darwin and Wallace owed the suggestion of their hypothesis of natural selection to a work on social theory. The underlying doctrine was, simply, that facts were to be understood by tracing their origins and historical connections. How far this historical understanding could take the enquirer

became the point at issue between what may be called the evolution philosophy and its critics: it may be expressed in the question whether or not origin determines validity. It was only gradually, however, that the point of controversy became clear; and, meanwhile, the application of the historical method vastly aided the understanding of the social order. In this reference, the treatise entitled *Ancient Law* (1861) by Sir Henry Maine marks an epoch in the study of law and institutions, and it had a much wider influence upon thought generally by furthering the use of the method which it employed. An early example of the application of the same method in economics may be found in the series of essays by Thomas Edward Cliffe Leslie, republished as *Essays in Political Economy* (1888); and the historical side of economics has subsequently been exhaustively worked.

Walter Bagehot's *Physics and Politics* (1869) is still more closely connected with the doctrine of evolution. It is described on the title-page as 'thoughts on the application of the principles of natural selection and inheritance to political society.' Luminous and suggestive though these studies are, it cannot be said that the influence of the theory of evolution expresses the leading characteristic of Bagehot's mind, especially as shown in his other political and economic works—*The English Constitution* (1867), *Lombard Street* (1873), and *Economic Studies* (1880). It was his insight into the actual forces, especially the human forces, at work that chiefly distinguished his treatment. Whereas even Mill looked upon economic and political processes as due to the composition of a few simple forces such as desire of wealth and aversion from labour, Bagehot knew the actual men who were doing the work, and he recognised the complexity of their motives and the degree in which they were influenced by habit, tradition and imitation. In this way he gave a great impulse to realistic study, as contrasted with the abstract method of the older economics and politics.

## VII. HENRY SIDGWICK AND SHADWORTH HODGSON

These writers had not much in common beyond the two points which have led to their being placed together here. They both saw that evolution was not an 'open sesame' to the secrets of philosophy, and neither owed allegiance to the idealist movement which rose to prominence in their time. They were probably



the ablest and most influential writers who made independent advances on lines more closely connected with the older English tradition.

Sidgwick taught philosophy for many years at Cambridge, and held the chair of moral philosophy there from 1883 until 1900, the year of his death. His reputation as a philosophical writer was made by his first book, *The Methods of Ethics* (1874). He afterwards published treatises on a similar scale on political economy and on politics; and, after his death, various occasional articles were issued in collected form, and a considerable series of books was compiled from his manuscripts, dealing with general philosophy, with contemporary ethical systems and with political constitutions. Within certain limits, Sidgwick may be regarded as a follower of John Stuart Mill, at least in ethics, politics and economics. In these subjects he took Mill's views as the basis of his own criticisms and reflections, and he accepted the utilitarian criterion. At the same time, he gave much more weight than Mill had done to the intellectualist tradition in philosophy. He saw that the empirical philosophy was based on conceptions which it was unable to justify by its customary method of tracing their origin in experience. This did not lead, however, to any agreement with Kant's analysis of knowledge. He was an adverse and somewhat unsympathetic critic of the Kantian theory. He inclined, rather, to a return to the 'natural realism' of Thomas Reid, on the question of the knowledge of external reality; and his ethical doctrine includes a synthesis of the views of Clarke and Butler with those of Mill.

His first book remains his most striking contribution to philosophy and the most accurate index of his philosophical attitude. In spite of his utilitarian sympathies, its starting-point and most fundamental ideas show the influence of a different type of thought. He starts with the fundamental notion of 'ought' or duty, and argues that enquiries into its origin in our consciousness do not affect its validity. The knowledge that there is something right or rational to be done depends, in the last resort, upon an intuition or immediate view of what is right or reasonable. All the old arguments of the utilitarians are swept away; the analysis of conduct into pursuit of pleasure is shown not only to be itself incorrect, but to be irreconcilable with the acceptance of general happiness as the ethical end. His own utilitarianism is based upon a new synthesis of intuitionism and empiricism. Here enters his central doctrine of the 'axioms of the practical reason.' These do not prescribe

any concrete end as good—that has to be determined in another way; but they are formal principles eternally valid whatever the nature of goodness may prove to be. To these formal principles are given the names prudence, benevolence and justice; but they include much less than is usually covered by these terms and may, perhaps, be adequately summed up in the statement that neither the time at which, nor the person by whom, a good is enjoyed affects the degree of its goodness. From the distinction and yet equal validity of the axioms of prudence and benevolence, Sidgwick's ethical theory terminates in a doctrine of 'the dualism of the practical reason.' It would appear, however, that this dualism really arises from the ambiguity of the term prudence, which may mean either 'regard for one's own good on the whole' or (what is not the same thing) the principle that 'hereafter as such is neither less nor more valuable than now.' Only the latter has a claim to be regarded as an absolute ethical principle; and it is not inconsistent with the axiom of benevolence. The other side of his utilitarianism—the reduction of goodness to terms of pleasure—is carried out by analysing conscious life into its elements and showing that each in its turn (except pleasure), when taken alone, cannot be regarded as ultimate good. This analytic method is characteristic of Sidgwick's thinking, as it was of that of most of his predecessors—intuitionist as well as empirical. It rests on the assumption that the nature of a thing can be completely ascertained by examination of the separate elements into which it can be distinguished by reflection—an assumption which was definitely discarded by the contemporary school of idealists, and on which the evolutionist writers also do not seem to have relied.

As was natural, therefore, Sidgwick did not produce a system of philosophy. He made many suggestions towards construction, but, in the main, his work was critical. He was severely critical of the attempts at speculative construction made in his day, and he carried on some controversies in which his subtlety and wit had full play: neither Spencer nor Green was his match in dialectics. It was not, however, of systems and theories only that he was a great critic. His powers are seen at their highest when he analysed and described the moral opinions of ordinary men, not as they are reflectively set down in philosophical books, but as they are expressed in life, compact of reason and tradition, fused by emotion and desire. The third book of his *Methods of Ethics* consists, in large part, of an examination of the morality of

commonsense. It is an elucidation and sifting of the ideas under which men act, often without clear consciousness of them; and it shows the sympathetic apprehension of a mind which shares the thoughts it describes and can yet see them in perspective and sum up their significance. Both the excellence of the matter and the distinction of the style should give at least this portion of his work a permanent place in literature.

Shadworth Hodgson's life was an example of rare devotion to philosophy. He had no profession and filled no public office, but spent his time in systematic reflection and writing; and his long life gave him the opportunity of reviewing, confirming and improving upon his first thoughts. There were two periods in his activity. In the former of these he published three books: *Time and Space* in 1865, *The Theory of Practice* in 1870 and *The Philosophy of Reflection* in 1878. Shortly thereafter he was instrumental in founding 'the Aristotelian Society for the systematic study of philosophy,' and he remained its president for fourteen years. This led to contact with other minds who looked at the same subjects from different points of view. He read many papers to the society, which were published in pamphlet form and in its *Proceedings*, and he built up his own system afresh in the light of familiar criticism. It took final form in *The Metaphysic of Experience*, a work of four volumes published in 1898.

As an analysis of experience, Hodgson's philosophy falls into line with a characteristic English tradition. It agrees with this tradition, also, in taking the simple feeling as the ultimate datum of experience. But, even here, and wherever there is experience, there is a distinction to be drawn—not the traditional distinction between subject and object, but that between consciousness and its object. Always, there are two aspects in any bit of experience—that of the object itself and that of the awareness of it or the subjective aspect; and these two are connected by the relation of knowledge. The sciences are concerned with the objective aspect only; philosophy has to deal with the subjective aspect, or the conscious process which is fundamental and common to all the variety of objects. Beyond this conscious reference there is nothing. 'The *mirage* of absolute existence, wholly apart from knowledge, is a common-sense prejudice.' Consciousness is commensurate with being; all existence has a subjective aspect. But this doctrine, he holds, is misinterpreted when mind and body are supposed to interact or when mental and bodily facts are regarded

as parallel aspects of the same substance. In psychology, Hodgson may be called a materialist, unfit as that name would be to describe his philosophical attitude. Ideas do not determine one another, nor does desire cause volition; the only real condition known to us is matter. And yet matter itself is a composite existence; it can be analysed into empirical percepts; and, therefore, it is itself conditioned by something which is not material: the very term *existence* implies relativity to some sort of consciousness or other. This is the conclusion of the general analysis of experience. Of the unseen world which lies beyond the material part of the world we cannot, he contends, have any speculative knowledge. But the ethical judgment and our own moral nature bring us into practical relation with that unseen world and thus permit a positive, although not a speculative, knowledge of it. In this way, in the final issue of his philosophy as well as in its fundamental positions, Hodgson regards himself as correcting and completing the work of Kant.

#### VIII. IDEALISTS

The latter half of the nineteenth century was marked by the work of a number of writers who were influenced by the speculations which, in Germany, had turned the results of Kant's criticism into a direction which he had not anticipated. This influence, which they shared, and their constant controversy with current empirical philosophy united these writers into what may be termed a school; and this school is sometimes described as neo-Kantian, more commonly as Hegelian or neo-Hegelian. But its members describe it simply as idealism, though it is an idealism of a form new in English thought. Before them, Kant's speculative successors had not obtained currency in England, unless, perhaps, in a slight measure, through some of the utterances of Coleridge; and the powerful influence of Hamilton's criticism had been almost sufficient to put a ban on what he called 'the philosophy of the unconditioned.'

The first important work of the new movement was *The Institutes of Metaphysic* (1854) by James Frederick Ferrier, professor at St Andrews. Before this date he had written a number of philosophical articles, and in particular a series of papers entitled 'The Philosophy of Consciousness,' which showed the trend of his thinking. After his death these were collected and published together along with a series of lectures as

*Lectures on Greek Philosophy and other philosophical remains* (1866). As a historian of philosophy, Ferrier did not pretend to exceptional research; but he had a remarkable power of entering into the mind of earlier thinkers and of giving a living presentation of their views. The history of philosophy was, for him, no mere record of discarded systems, but 'philosophy itself taking its time.' He was a sympathetic student, also, of the German philosophers banned by his friend Hamilton. It is difficult to trace any direct influence of Hegel upon his own doctrine, and, indeed, he said that he could not understand Hegel. But, both his earlier and his later writings have an affinity with Fichte—especially in their central doctrine: the stress laid on self-consciousness, and its distinction from the 'mental states' with which the psychologist is concerned. This doctrine connects him with Berkeley, also. He was one of the first to appreciate the true nature of Berkeley's thought, as not a mere transition-stage between Locke and Hume, but as a discovery of the spiritual nature of reality. The philosophy which he worked out in *The Institutes of Metaphysic* is, however, strikingly original. He claimed that it was 'Scottish to the core.' But it is very different from the traditional Scottish philosophy. It disclaims all connection with psychology. He even formulates a false and psychological theorem as the counterpart of each true and metaphysical theorem. And this reiterated opposition, it must be confessed, grows a little wearisome and can be excused only by the backward state of psychology, and its confusion with philosophy, at the time when the book was written. Further, the Scottish philosophy relied on intuition or immediate apprehension of reality; Ferrier's method is that of rational deduction from a first principle. Philosophy is 'reasoned truth,' he says; but 'it is more proper that philosophy should be reasoned, than that it should be true.' Unfortunately, he takes Spinoza's method as his model, though he does not follow the model in all details. There is no array of definitions, axioms and postulates, but only propositions, each deduced from the preceding. Thus, a heavy weight is thrown on the first proposition of the series. This is the primary law or condition of all knowledge, and is stated in the words, 'Along with whatever any intelligence knows it must, as the ground or condition of its knowledge, have some cognisance of itself.' What follows is little more than the elaboration of this statement. Ferrier has not only an epistemology, or theory of knowledge, but also an agnology, or theory of ignorance, the main doctrine of which is that we can

only be ignorant of what can possibly be known. Hence, in his ontology, or theory of being, he reaches the conclusion that absolute existence is 'a supreme and infinite and everlasting mind in synthesis with all things.' Ferrier's writings had, and continue to have, a considerable reputation, yet a reputation hardly commensurate with their philosophical insight and perfect style. Perhaps the formalism of his method counteracted the lucidity of the thought. Soon after his death (1864) English philosophy came under the influence of the more comprehensive genius of Hegel.

The first English work directly due to the influence of Hegel was *The Secret of Hegel* (1865) by James Hutchison Stirling. Educated as a physician, he first heard of Hegel in accidental conversation. Hegel was described as the reconciler of philosophy and religion, and Stirling, fascinated by the thought, soon afterwards threw up his practice, settled for some years on the continent—in Germany and in France—and devoted himself with ardour to philosophical study, especially to the mastery of Hegel's system. He returned to publish the results of his work; and, although he wrote many books afterwards—especially an important *Text-book to Kant* (1881)—*The Secret of Hegel* remains his greatest work. It consists of translation, commentary, introduction and original discourse; and it shows the process by which the author approached and grappled with his subject. Sometimes it is as difficult as its original; more frequently, it illuminates Hegel both by a persistent effort of thought and by occasional flashes of insight. Its style is characteristic. Altogether lacking in the placid flow of the academic commentator, and suggesting the influence of Carlyle, it is irregular, but forceful and imaginative, a fit medium for the thinking which it expressed. What Stirling meant by the 'secret' of Hegel was presumably the relation of Hegel's philosophy to that of Kant. In Hegel's construction he found a method and point of view which justified the fundamental ideas of religion, and, at the same time, made clear the one-sidedness of the conceptions of the 'age of enlightenment,' at the end of which Kant stood, still hampered by its negations and abstractions. And Stirling's favourite and most lively criticisms were directed against the apostles of the enlightenment and their followers of the nineteenth century.

Stirling was first in the field, and, although cut off from any academic position, he continued to exercise a strong intellectual influence. Independently of him, and soon after he began to publish, the influence of Hegel was shown by a number of other

writers, most of whom were connected with Oxford or Glasgow. Like Stirling, they brought out the ideas in Kant which pointed to Hegel's view ; but, on the other hand, most of them paid little attention to, or altogether disregarded, the details of the Hegelian method. Of these writers one of the earliest and, in some respects, the most important, was Thomas Hill Green, professor of moral philosophy at Oxford. His work was constructive in aim and, to a large extent, in achievement ; and it was inspired by a belief in the importance of right-thinking for life. The latter characteristic Green shared with most of the writers who sympathised with his philosophical views, and it accounted for much of the enthusiasm with which these views were received. His constructive work, however, was preceded by a very thorough criticism. He saw that it was necessary, first of all, to expose the assumptions and inconsistencies underlying the systems of Mill and Spencer, and that these systems were really based upon the philosophy of Hume. Green's dissection of the latter appeared, in 1874, in the form of two elaborate 'introductions' to a new edition of Hume's *Treatise*. This work, as he confesses, was 'an irksome labour.' He deals at length with Locke and Hume, more shortly with Berkeley and some of the moralists ; and he follows these writers from point to point of their argument with unwearying, though sometimes wearisome, persistence. But he was an unsympathetic critic. Locke and Hume were rather careless of the niceties of terminology, and some of the contradictions which he finds are, perhaps, only verbal and might have been avoided by a change of expression. Enough remain, however, amply to justify his accusation that their thought was full of incoherences ; and, if these had been brought into clearer relief, and distinguished from merely verbal inconsistencies, the effectiveness of his criticism might have been increased. But he did succeed in showing 'that the philosophy based on the abstraction of feeling, in regard to morals, no less than to nature, was with Hume played out.' He appealed to 'Englishmen under five-and-twenty' to close their Mill and Spencer and open their Kant and Hegel ; and this appeal marks an epoch in English thought in the nineteenth century.

In the years following the 'introductions' to Hume, Green published some occasional articles on philosophical topics. He, also, exerted a great influence by his academic lectures—the more important of which are printed in his collected *Works* (three volumes, 1885—8). His greatest book, *Prolegomena to Ethics*, appeared in 1883, the year after his death. This book does not profess to be a

system either of metaphysics or of ethics ; but it supplies the groundwork for such a system. It is a vindication of the spiritual nature of the world and of man. Neither nature nor man can be constructed out of the sensations or feelings which formed the data of the empirical philosophers. Our knowledge 'presupposes' that there is a connected world to be known. The relations involved, and inexplicable on empirical methods, can be understood only as implying the action of mind. 'The action of one self-conditioning and self-determining mind' is, therefore, a postulate of all knowledge, and our knowledge is a 'reproduction' of this activity in or as the mind of man. In the same way, our moral activity is a reproduction in us of the one eternal mind. Under all the limitations of organic life and of the time-process generally, the mind of man carries with it the characteristic, inexplicable on the theory of naturalism, of 'being an object to itself.' This position is not to be established by deductive or inductive methods ; in this sense it cannot be proved. But it is a point of view from which—and from which alone—we can understand both the world and ourselves and see how it is that 'we are and do what we consciously are and do.' In the later books of his *Prolegomena* this doctrine is applied to the interpretation of the history of the moral life and of moral ideas ; and this portion of his work shows his powers as a writer at their best. In other writings the same conception is applied to social and religious questions. It is conspicuous in his *Lectures on the Principles of Political Obligation*, where he maintains that will, not force, is the basis of the state, and gives a fresh reading to the doctrine of the 'general will.'

In his metaphysics, Green does not follow the method of Hegel's dialectic ; and in his reading of history there is no trace of the Hegelian theory that development in time follows the same stages as logical development. The gradual steps by which the realisation of reason or of self is brought about in the time-process are not investigated. Only, it is assumed that the process is purposive, that history is the 'reproduction' of the eternal mind. How it comes about that error and moral evil affect the process is not explained, and the metaphor of 'reproduction,' as well as the whole relation of the time-process to eternal reality, is left somewhat vague.

Of the numerous writers who represent a type of thought similar to Green's in origin and outlook only a few can be mentioned here. In 1874, the year in which Green's 'introductions' to



Hume were published, there appeared, also, *The Logic of Hegel*, translated from the latter's *Encyclopaedia* by William Wallace, who afterwards succeeded to Green's chair of moral philosophy at Oxford. A second edition of this work, in which the introductory matter was considerably extended, was issued in 1892; and this was followed, in 1894, by *Hegel's Philosophy of Mind*, and, in 1898 (after the author's death), by *Lectures and Essays on Natural Theology and Ethics*. Wallace devoted himself more directly than his associates to the elucidation of Hegel's thought; but it may be doubted whether he himself adhered any more closely than they did to the details of the dialectic. The prolegomena and introductory essays, by which his translations were prefaced, are not merely explanatory of difficulties. They have often the character of original interpretations; they approach the subject from different points of view and show a rare power of selecting essential factors. Wallace had wide intellectual sympathies and found matter of agreement with philosophers of different schools; but all, in his hands, led towards a central idealism. His work consisted in pointing out the various avenues of approach to the temple of idealism, rather than in unveiling its mysteries.

In *An Introduction to the Philosophy of Religion* (1880), John Caird, principal of the university of Glasgow, produced a work, original in manner, but essentially Hegelian in doctrine. A similar character marked all the work of his younger brother, Edward Caird, professor of moral philosophy at Glasgow, and afterwards master of Balliol college, Oxford. The influence of Edward Caird rivalled that of his friend Green, and their teaching was in fundamental agreement. Caird, however, had a facility of literary expression such as Green did not possess; he was, also, more inclined to attack questions by the method of tracing the historical development of thought. His first important work was *A Critical Account of the Philosophy of Kant* (1877), which was superseded by *The Critical Philosophy of Immanuel Kant* (two volumes, 1889). This work is a triumph of philosophical exposition and criticism. Based upon a mastery of the whole range of Kantian scholarship, it brings into relief the leading ideas by which Kant himself was guided, and, through criticism of his arguments, gives an interpretation of it as tending, when consistently worked out, towards a system of speculative idealism. A brilliant and sympathetic exposition is contained in his monograph on Hegel (1883). His Gifford lectures, *The Evolution of Religion* (1893), deal less than his other works with the criticism of philosophers; they are

a study of the nature of religion, especially as exhibited in the development of the Christian faith.

The writings of Francis Herbert Bradley are so important for the understanding of English idealism in the nineteenth century that it seems necessary to make some reference here to the work of a writer still living. His achievement has been differently viewed: sometimes as being the finest exposition of idealism, sometimes as marking its dissolution. His first philosophical work, *Ethical Studies*, appeared in 1876, about the same date as the first books of Green and Caird. It is full of brilliant criticism of conventional ethical ideas. The manner was different; but the doctrine seemed to agree with that which was beginning to be taught in the lecture-rooms. Here, also, 'self-realisation,' that is, the realisation of the 'true self,' was the watchword. His *Principles of Logic*, published in 1883, broke new ground and showed, also, a development of the dialectical manner. The inadequacy of the 'particular,' the implication of the 'universal' in all knowledge, were familiar enough, but the defects of empirical logic had never been exposed with such depth of insight, such subtlety of reasoning, such severity of phrase. The work was a triumph for the idealist theory of knowledge. It is noteworthy that these two books have never been reprinted in England, presumably because the author became more or less dissatisfied with their teaching. There is, at least, a difference of emphasis in the teaching of his next and greatest work, *Appearance and Reality* (1893), which has been allowed to pass through several editions.

This remarkable book has probably exerted more influence upon philosophical thinking in English-speaking countries than any other treatise of the last thirty years. But no summary can convey a clear idea of its teaching. The conceptions of popular thought and of metaphysics alike are in it subjected to detailed, relentless criticism. Even the distinction, within the book, between the chapters devoted to 'appearance' and those described as 'reality' seems artificial, for everything is found to be riddled with contradictions. And these contradictions all belong to our thought because it is relational. Green had held that experience requires relations, and had argued thence to the need for a relating mind as the principle of reality. Bradley, too, insists that 'for thought what is not relative is nothing' but he draws the very different conclusion that 'our experience, where relational, is not true.' Of this doctrine all the brilliant disquisitions that

follow are applications, with the exception of the author's own assertions about the absolute, which, being relational, must be affected by the same vice of contradiction. If his argument about relations is valid, the idealism of Green and Caird falls to the ground. His method is more akin to Hegel's than theirs was; but he also ignores the Hegelian triad; he does not attempt any consecutive evolution of the categories; even his doctrine of 'degrees of reality' is more Spinozistic than Hegelian. As a whole, the book is a great original achievement—a highly abstract dialectical exercise, in which the validity of every argument depends upon the fundamental position that relations necessarily involve contradiction. A later book, *Essays on Truth and Reality* (1914), deals in great part with controversies which belong to the twentieth century; without deserting the positions of the earlier work, it is less purely negative in its tendency and more devoted to the discovery of elements of truth than to the exposure of contradictions.

## IX. OTHER WRITERS

In the latter part of the nineteenth century there were other philosophical tendencies at work than those already mentioned. There were idealist writers whose idealism was of a different type, resembling Berkeley's rather than Hegel's, and who are sometimes called personal idealists; there was a movement of reaction from the type of idealism last described in the direction of philosophical realism or naturalism; and there were the first indications of the new movements of thought which have characterised the early years of the twentieth century.

Among the writers classed as personal idealists may be counted Alexander Campbell Fraser. His philosophical career, as student, professor and thinker, began before the Victorian era and lasted into the present reign. He was a pupil of Hamilton at Edinburgh, was for ten years professor of philosophy in New college there and succeeded to the university chair on Hamilton's death in 1856. His first book, *Essays in Philosophy*, was published in 1856, his last, a small monograph entitled *Berkeley and Spiritual Realism*, in 1908. Apart from minor works, among which special mention should be made of his monographs on Locke (1890) and Berkeley (1881), he is best known as the editor of the standard

editions of Berkeley's *Works* (1871) and of Locke's *Essay* (1894), and as the author of Gifford lectures *The Philosophy of Theism* (1896). He also wrote an interesting and valuable account of his life and views entitled *Biographia Philosophica* (1904).

For a great many years, Fraser, Caird and Bain powerfully affected philosophical thought in Scotland through their university teaching. Owing to the position of philosophy in the academic curriculum, their influence upon the wider intellectual life of the country was almost equally great, though less easy to trace with any exactness. From Bain, his pupils learned precision in thinking and an interest in psychology as a science, together with, perhaps, a somewhat limited comprehension of metaphysical problems. Caird gave an insight into the history of thought and provided a point of view from which the world and man's life might be understood; many of his pupils have shown in their writings that they had learned his great language and were able to develop and apply his ideas. Fraser did not teach a system or found a school; he awakened and stimulated thought, without controlling its direction; he called forth in his hearers a sense of the mysteries of existence, and he encouraged in many the spirit of reflection. He had no system; but his thought was essentially constructive, though the construction was based on an almost Humean scepticism. On one point, however, he never yielded to sceptical analysis—the reality of the self as conscious activity. He found the same thought in Berkeley, and he may almost be said to have rediscovered Berkeley for modern readers. Of the world beyond self he could find no theory which could be satisfactorily established by strict reasoning. But he saw (as Hume saw in his first work) that science has its assumptions as well as theology. In particular, he looked upon the postulate of uniformity as an act of moral faith in the rationality of the universe, and it was as a 'venture of faith' that he interpreted the universe as grounded in the reason and goodness of God.

The reaction from idealism is most strikingly illustrated in the writings of Robert Adamson. The most learned of his contemporary philosophers, his earlier works are written from the standpoint of a neo-Hegelian idealism. These works are a small volume *On the Philosophy of Kant* (1879), a monograph on Fichte (1881), and an article on logic (1882), long afterwards (1911) republished in book form. The fundamental opposition of philosophical doctrines he regarded as 'the opposition between Hegelianism on the one hand

and scientific naturalism or realism on the other'; and he rejected the latter doctrine because its explanation of thought as the product of antecedent conditions was incompetent to explain thought as self-consciousness. The problem which he set himself was to re-think from the former point of view the new material concerning nature, mind and history provided by modern science. He came gradually to the opinion that this could not be done—that idealism was inadequate. His posthumously published lectures *The Development of Modern Philosophy* (1903) show that he was engaged in working out a reconstruction from the point of view which he had at first held incompetent—that of realism. But his suggestions do not point to a theory of mechanism or materialism. Although mind has come into being, it is as essential as nature: both are partial manifestations of reality. But he had not an opportunity fully to work out his constructive theory or to examine its adequacy and coherence.

The new tendencies which distinguish more recent philosophy illustrate also the increasing reaction of the literature of the United States of America upon English thought. The theory known as pragmatism is definitely of trans-Atlantic origin, and forms of what is called the new realism seem to have been started independently in the United States and in this country. The latter theory is, largely, a revival of older views: both the natural realism of Reid and the scholastic doctrine of the reality of universals appear to have contributed to its formation. Pragmatism is a more original doctrine; but its seeds also lie in the past: it has been connected with the prevailingly practical tone of much English thought; and more definite anticipations of its leading idea might be found in some of the later English writers of the nineteenth century.

## CHAPTER II

### HISTORIANS, BIOGRAPHERS AND POLITICAL ORATORS

#### A. WRITERS ON MEDIEVAL AND MODERN HISTORY<sup>1</sup>

IN a comparison of English historical literature in the nineteenth with that in the eighteenth century, nothing is more striking than the advance and the expansion of the study of the national past. As was remarked in an earlier volume<sup>2</sup>, Hume's was the first history of England by a native historian worthy to be classed as literature ; and, after him, the subject fell largely into the hands of professed political or ecclesiastical partisans. Robertson's *History of Scotland* is not wholly exempt from such a charge ; Smollett's continuation of *Hume* is certainly open to it ; and no other work in the field of national history can be said to have been produced in the course of the century which has survived it except as material for subsequent use. A reason for the unproductiveness, on this head, of the closing years of the eighteenth century, and the early years of its successor, might, of course, be sought in the great national struggle against the French revolution and the conquering power to which it gave birth. This struggle finds its counterpart in the endeavours of the romanticists to break up the literary and artistic solidarity of classicism, and to trace the diversity of actual life in the specific features presenting themselves in national, provincial or local institutions, forms of government, social ways and manners. Scott, more than any other writer in verse or prose, by his incomparable historical novels, taught English historians to reproduce in their works the atmosphere of the times and the colouring of the localities which they desired to recall. The lesson was reinforced by two different currents of studies and interests. The first was a result of the

<sup>1</sup> For writers on ancient history and early ecclesiastical history, see, *ante*, vol. XII, chap. XIV.

<sup>2</sup> See, *ante*, vol. X, p. 280.

diligent enquiry into the *origines* of our national institutions and their effect upon our national life which formed part of the new movement of the new century—in other words, of the beginnings of historical criticism<sup>1</sup>. In the study and literary treatment of the national history, this research concentrated itself in the labours of what has been called the Germanist school, whose adherents strove to show

‘the extent to which modern constitutional ideas were connected with medieval facts, and the share that the German element has had in the development of institutions and classes,’ and ‘succeeded in establishing the characteristically Germanic general aspect of English history, a result which does not exclude Roman influence, but has to be reckoned with in all attempts to establish definitely its bearing and strength<sup>2</sup>.’

The second current, again, was one which affected England in common with all other western nations, but which acted upon her life and literature in a way peculiar to herself. In the period roughly circumscribed by the revolutionary years 1830 and 1848—9, social questions, concerned with the economic conditions of the people at large, assumed an unprecedented prominence; and these led to a study, very little followed before, of the economic influences under which nations arise and have their being. Other sciences were called upon to contribute towards an understanding of the foundations of popular life, the materials out of which it is formed and the reasons which determine its progress or decay. Historical research, animated by a living interest in the present, rather than by a romantic yearning for a revival of the past, thus came to demand, and find, new fields for its labours.

The first name to be mentioned among writers of English history from the close of the eighteenth century onwards is, unmistakably, that of Sharon Turner. Born and educated in London<sup>3</sup>, he was, as a boy, attracted to the study of northern literature through a version, in Percy’s *Five Pieces of Runic Poetry*, of that *Death-Song of Ragnar Lodbrok* which is held to have first suggested the study in England of Norse antiquity<sup>4</sup>. He

<sup>1</sup> Cf., *ante*, vol. XII, chap. XIV.

<sup>2</sup> See P. Vinogradoff’s illuminating introduction to *Villainage in England: Essays on English and Medieval History* (Oxford, 1892).

<sup>3</sup> He was a pupil at James Davis’s academy in Pentonville, and his literary career illustrates the value of the attempts made in these academies to supply instruction in modern subjects. Cf. the syllabus of courses in history and geography by Priestley at Warrington (where he worked from 1761 to 1767) appended to Parker, Irene, *Dissenting Academies in England* (Cambridge, 1914); and see, generally, *ante*, vol. I, pp. 381—3.

<sup>4</sup> See, for some account of the literary influence of the *Death Song* upon Sir William Temple and others, *ante*, vol. I, pp. 221—4.

early abandoned the active pursuit of the legal profession, and, in 1795, settled for many years in the neighbourhood of the British Museum, long the constant resort of his strenuous leisure. Here, the Old English MSS in the Cottonian library became his chief study, and it was on his researches in these and similar sources that was founded his *History of England from the earliest period to the Norman Conquest*, produced from 1799 to 1805, after sixteen years of preparatory labours. It was well received by Palgrave and other authorities, but was also subjected to unfavourable criticism, which, in one instance, called forth a vindication from the author<sup>1</sup>. On the whole, the success of the work was such as to encourage him to produce, in steady sequence, a continuation from the Norman conquest to 1500, and a further continuation, covering the reign of Henry VIII, with a 'political history of the commencement of the English Reformation,' which he afterwards carried on to the death of Elizabeth. The latter portions of the work, published in 1829, under the collective title *The History of England*, failed to command a popularity equalling that of their predecessors. The reformation period, in particular, had, as we shall see, been recently treated by Lingard, some of whose ecclesiastical views, indeed, Sharon Turner was desirous of controverting. But his volumes dealing with Old English times, though they share his general characteristics of great amplitude and sententiousness of expression, have the distinctive note of original research both wide in range and assiduous; nor can he be refused the credit of having pointed the way in which Kemble and Thorpe followed, and thus made it possible for Palgrave and Freeman to construct their great works. It was in Sharon Turner that the interest was first awakened which led to the appointment (in 1800) of the first Record commission, whose composition, unfortunately, rendered its efforts of but little effect, till, mainly through the efforts of (Sir) Harris Nicolas, it was superseded (in 1836) by the new commission, of which Palgrave was the soul. Sharon Turner himself cannot rank as a great historian; and it might, perhaps, be questioned whether his proper place is among historians at all. His early volumes are marred by a cumbrous method, a tedious style and an antiquated philology; yet, a survey of their contents suffices to show the breadth of their author's design and the indefatigable industry expended upon its execution. His place in literature he owes, not to service or circumstance, but to his courage and energy in research, which

<sup>1</sup> See bibliography.



enabled him, first among English writers, to make his countrymen aware of the elements of future national greatness revealed in the life of our immigrant forefathers.

Some time before the new movement in English historical studies, which had derived a strong impulse from what had, of recent years, been done in France and Germany<sup>1</sup>, can be said to have been fairly at work, two writers had produced historical works of national significance. John Lingard's *History of England*, indeed, had been in preparation for about thirteen years, before, in 1819, the first three volumes of the work appeared, bringing it to the end of the reign of Henry VII, a point very near the critical part of the narrative, if its avowed more special purpose be considered. Lingard's earliest book, *The Antiquities of the Anglo-Saxon Church*, had been published so early as 1806. Here is observable, together with a determination to base statements of historical facts upon original authorities, the desire, which became the mainspring of his *History* and, it is not too much to say, the object of his life, to convince his countrymen of their misconceptions as to the Roman catholic faith and its influence upon the action of its adherents. He was himself born and bred as a catholic (although his father was a protestant by descent), and owed practically the whole of his training to Douay, where, it is stated, no instruction was given in history. On the dispersion of the college at Douay, Lingard spent some time in the centre of English catholic affairs. He became acquainted with Charles Butler, author of *The Book of the Roman Catholic Church* and long active in promoting the abolition of penal laws against catholics. These efforts, as implying long participation in church affairs, were vehemently opposed by John Milner, afterwards titular bishop of Castabala and a ruthless adversary of Lingard and the moderate catholic party. Lingard was all but deterred from carrying out his design of writing a history of England, which he had cherished during the latter part of a collegiate life of nearly thirty years. Declining the presidency of Ushaw college, where he had held the arduous post of vice-president—as he afterwards refused a mitre—he, in 1811, took up the humble

<sup>1</sup> In France, where the spirit that pervaded the labours of Mabillon and his fellow-Benedictines had never been wholly extinguished, the *École des Chartes*, which marked the beginning of a systematic training in the study of medieval documents, dates from 1820, though it had to pass through a period of uncertainty, and even of temporary extinction, before its revival nine years later. In Germany, the publication of *Monumenta Germaniæ Historica*, the first modern collection of medieval sources edited with all the appliances of modern critical scholarship, began in 1826.

duties of the mission at Hornby near Lancaster; and here he remained, almost continuously, during the rest of his life, which ended there, forty years later, in his eighty-first year. The remote northern presbytery became a sort of literary centre, in which he was periodically visited by Brougham and other leaders of the northern circuit, and whence he exercised an influence over the conduct of catholic affairs, which neither Milner's intrigues nor the frank differences of opinion between Wiseman and himself could extinguish. This influence was due to his *History of England*, which appeared in the critical period of catholic affairs preceding the Emancipation act and, at Rome, was held to have largely contributed to the change in public feeling which had made that act possible. Whether or not pope Leo XII, as Lingard believed, not long before the completion of his *History*, intended to acknowledge his services by raising him, sooner or later, to the cardinalate, such a recognition of endeavours equally free from blind partisanship and from adulation would have done honour to the church which he loved and served.

Lingard's first three volumes at once achieved what, in the circumstances, must be reckoned a remarkable success. It is not too much to say that this was mainly due to the use made by the writer of his study of original MSS, both at home and in Rome, and to the straightforward and lucid style of his narrative. Few historians have written so little *ad captandum* as Lingard whether in this or in later, and more contentious, portions of his work; if there is in him little warmth of sympathy, neither is there any vituperative vehemence. No historian has ever better trained himself in the art of avoiding the giving of offence; and none was less likely to be 'run away with' by ardent admiration for those fascinating historical characters in which fanaticism is often intermingled with devotion to a great and noble cause. On the other hand, there never was a more vigilant recorder of facts than Lingard, or one whom criticism was less successful in convicting of unfounded statements; it was not his way to take anything in his predecessors for granted, and he wished his work to fulfil the purpose of a complete refutation of Hume, without the appearance of such a purpose<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> This is brought out in John Allen's review in *The Edinburgh Review* (April 1825, vol. XLII), where Lingard is blamed for 'his anathema against the philosophy of history, which he is pleased to term the philosophy of romance,' but which is either a sacrifice to cant or the result of his dislike of Hume. Allen's second review of Lingard (June 1826) dealt specially with the St Bartholomew, a problem which may almost be described as still under treatment; and it was in reply to this that Lingard issued his *Vindication*

In the subsequent volumes of his *History*, Lingard's skill and judgment were put to the severest of tests, and it is not unjust to him to say that the history of the reformation, or that of a particularly complicated section of it, was never written with more discretion than it was by him. On the one hand, he refused to shut his eyes, like some other judges of conservative tendencies, to certain aspects of the conflict—the dark side of monasticism, for instance. On the other, he declined to launch forth into discussions of the general consequences of the English reformation, and allowed the course of events—of which, in his account of the reigns of Mary and Elizabeth, he was able to add many new elucidations—to tell its own story. Even in relating the critical struggle between Elizabeth and her Scottish rival, he hardly becomes a partisan; while his narrative of the reign of James I plainly marks the end of Roman catholicism as an organic part of the national life. The later volumes of the *History* followed in fairly regular succession, the last (vol. VIII) appearing in 1830, with a notable account of the antecedents of the revolution of 1688, including the character of James II. Lingard moved more easily as his work progressed, as well as in the careful revisions to which he subjected it<sup>1</sup> and in which he freely entered into an examination of views opposed to his own, Macaulay's among them. While his protestant assailants found no palpable holes in his armour, he maintained his own position in the catholic world, consistently holding aloof from ultramontane views and shaping his course as seemed right to him. Yet, his conviction that he had signally contributed to the change in educated public opinion in England as to his church and her history, though the intention implied is compatible with perfect veracity of statement as well as perspicacity of judgment, cannot be said to imply that search after truth for its own sake which is the highest motive of the historian. Lingard's tone is not apologetic, but his purpose avowedly is; and, while his work retains its place among histories of England based on scholarly research, conceived in a spirit of fairness and composed with lucidity and skill, it lacks alike the intensity of spirit which animates a great national history and the breadth of sympathy which is inseparable from intellectual

(1826). Southey's criticisms of the reformation volumes in *The Quarterly Review* (December 1825, vol. XXXIII) were expanded in his popular *Book of the Church*, which led to a literary controversy between its author and Charles Butler. On the catholic side, the irreconcilable Milner was provoked by the account of the earlier part of the reformation, and in vain attempted to procure the condemnation of the book at Rome.

<sup>1</sup> The last edition revised by himself bears the date 1854—5.

independence. Lingard's book, it should be added, is a political history only, and sheds no light on either the literary or the social progress of the nation.

It was only at a relatively advanced stage of Lingard's career as a historian—in 1835—that he made acquaintance with the historical work of his contemporary Henry Hallam, a typically national figure among eminent English writers of history<sup>1</sup>. Eton and Oxford, although they had helped to form the man and give him free access to what was best in the social, political and intellectual life of his generation, had done little else to equip him for the career which he preferred to bar or parliament. Inasmuch as he enjoyed, throughout life, ample leisure and easy conditions of existence, he could take his time about both reading and writing; but he used these opportunities with a conscientious thoroughness such as no class-room training or examination-room system could have surpassed in effectiveness. The 'classic Hallam,' as Byron chose to call the Edinburgh reviewer whose sole avowed pretensions to fame had, so far, consisted in his contributions to *Musae Etonenses* (1795), spent more than a decade in preparing his first book, which, on its appearance (in 1818), revealed itself at once as what every production of Hallam's maturity became as a matter of course—a 'standard' work of historical literature and learning<sup>2</sup>. In *A View of the State of Europe during the Middle Ages*, he undertook to subject to a philosophical survey the course of European history, as a whole, during the ten centuries from the great popular migrations to the formation of the chief states of modern Europe, and, at the same time, to consider the special growth of each particular state. In this truly comprehensive essay, Hallam showed himself both too restrained and too sure-footed to lapse into mere generalities, although the work cannot, of course, rank with Guizot's rather later *Histoire de la Civilisation en France*, which, though unfinished, also overshadowed the same writer's earlier and more concise *Histoire générale de la Civilisation en Europe*. The chapter on England in *The Middle Ages*

<sup>1</sup> It is curious, in view of the high reputation of Hallam's name with successive generations of historical students, that the only biographical account of him worth notice should be Mignet's, in *Éloges Historiques* (Paris, 1864). This is remarked by Sir Leslie Stephen in his article on Hallam in vol. xxiv. *D. of N. B.* (1890), where a few additional facts, likewise due to family information, are supplied.

<sup>2</sup> Hallam's way of asserting his sureness as to facts was overpowering in conversation; and Thomas Campbell described him as, though devoid of gall and bitterness, yet 'a perfect boia-contradictor.' (Campbell's *Life and Letters*, ed. Beattie W., vol. III, p. 315.)

unmistakably announces the future historian of the English constitution, with his consciousness of the value, for an insight into the political and social development of a nation, of an enquiry into the continuous growth of its laws. For the rest, the limits of Hallam's gifts as a historian are manifest in the earliest of his works; but, together with them, there becomes apparent the unflinching severity of his moral judgment, the most distinctive note of, what Mignet calls him, 'the magistrate of history.'

In 1827 was published the best known of Hallam's works—best known, because of the clearness and solidity that still keep it a text-book of the subject which it treats, and which, to the large majority of students of English history, is the sum and substance of all that compels their interest in the national past. We may regret, especially in view of the great internal changes undergone by this country in the epoch of Hallam's later manhood, that he should have fixed the death of George II as the *terminus ad quem* of his *Constitutional History of England*; and we may wish, since he would thus have widened the point of view of a long succession of English learners of history, that he had drawn the line of the book's *terminus a quo* at the beginning of the middle ages instead of at their close; albeit, in this respect, his own *Middle Ages*, in some measure, and the later works of Stubbs and others most effectively supplemented his labours, and gave true unity to the whole subject. Hallam's own political opinions, however, would hardly have carried him as a historian through the periods of revolution in France and democratic reform at home; he distinctly dissociated himself from the Reform bill movement of 1830—2, and showed a distrust of the multitude which even Sir Archibald Alison's could hardly have surpassed; while his heart was with the constitutional progress which, after the violent interruption of the Civil war and the ensuing *interregnum*, was consummated in the revolution of 1688, and crowned by the passing of the Act of settlement. In other words, Hallam was a whig of the 'finality' school; what he approved and admired in our laws and institutions was their power of endurance, after they had resulted from centuries of conflict with the pretensions of the prerogative, which came over with foreign conquest, while the principles of the nation's laws were rooted in its own past. This conflict forms, as it were, the heart or nucleus of his story; nor does it lose anything of its sternness or of its inner consistency in his hands. His style is without fascination, charm or richness; but it is raised above a mere business tone by the

sense manifest beneath it of great issues worthy of arduous struggles; so that it never wearies, just as the great interests of life which it befits a man to cherish—the cause of the commonweal and of personal freedom—never grow stale. Of these things, Hallam's work is, as it were, the representative; what lies beyond, it ignores. Hallam's *Constitutional History* was, at a later date (1861—3), adequately continued by Sir Thomas Erskine May, who had made a name for himself by his standard work, *The Rules, Orders and Proceedings of the House of Commons* (1854). His *Constitutional History* is distinguished both by the admirable perspicuity of its arrangement and by the decisive clearness of its tone. Walter Bagehot's *The English Constitution* (1867) will be briefly noticed elsewhere<sup>1</sup>.

When, in his last great book, Hallam once more passed out of the domain of politics into that of literature, and undertook, with impartial eye and undeflected judgment, to furnish an *Introduction to the Literature of Europe during the Fifteenth, Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (1837—9), it was as if he desired to bequeath to the world of letters the knowledge he had garnered during a long life. He had remained a stranger to few fields of literary study and become familiar with most of the homes of European civilisation, since its new birth in the land which he had probably loved next to his own, and which, in his later years, had been specially endeared to him by its varied associations with the two sons whose names will always be remembered with that of their father. The work, which, to this day, few literary students would be willing to spare, illustrates, more than any other of his productions, the equity as well as the acumen of his critical conclusions; but the form it takes is too compressed for it to satisfy more exacting demands. Without being reticent where candour is called for, or shallow where great depths have to be sounded, it offers a model of an introductory survey that needs to be filled up with the comments and illustrations of the best kind of cicerone-ship; and, though necessarily it must fail more and more to satisfy in parts, it will, as a whole, long challenge supersession.

At one time, it might have seemed as if, in the charmed circle of the whigs, one of its most honoured members, who, early in his career (1791), had, not without credit, crossed swords with Burke, were, after he had entered into the second and less eccentric phase of his political opinions, destined to take a leading place among English historians. But Sir James Mackintosh, who, like Macaulay,

<sup>1</sup> See, *post*, pp. 142—3.

was tempted from home by public employment in India, was without the intellectual energy of his junior, and less indifferent than he to the attractions of clubs and society. Moreover, like many lesser men, he could never quite settle down to one particular line of study and production, and the claim of philosophy seemed, on the whole, the strongest upon his mind. On his homeward voyage from Bombay, in 1811—12, he had begun an introduction to a history of England from the revolution of 1688 to that of 1789; but he speedily entered parliament, and, for some time, held a professorship of law and general politics at Haileybury. Towards the end of his life (1830), he published a much-read *Dissertation on the Progress of Ethical Philosophy, chiefly during the 17th and 18th Centuries*<sup>1</sup>. Thus, little leisure was left, or sought, for the *History of England* expected from Mackintosh's pen; and, besides a volume bearing that title, contributed by him to Lardner's *Cabinet Cyclopaedia*, he only produced an unfinished *History of the Revolution in England in 1688*, which was unsatisfactorily edited by William Wallace, with a continuation, to say the least, ill-suited to either the book or its subject. This performance is chiefly known by Macaulay's essay upon it—not itself one of his choicest efforts—and by the scandal which ensued. Mackintosh, notwithstanding the honour and glory which he enjoyed among a large circle of his contemporaries, can, as a historian, hardly be regarded as more than a precursor of Macaulay, to whom we accordingly turn.

Thomas Babington (lord) Macaulay's youthful *Edinburgh* essay on Hallam's *Constitutional History*, with all its enthusiasm, indicates very clearly the qualities which distinguish him from the author of that work, whose whole spirit, he says, is 'that of the bench, not that of the bar.' For himself, he was, among modern historians, the greatest of advocates; as his early essay *History*<sup>2</sup> shows, he had drunk too deeply of the spirit of the ancient masters and had too closely studied their manner of narrative

<sup>1</sup> It was this essay, first produced as a supplement to the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, which gave rise to James Mill's bitter *Fragment on Mackintosh* (really an apology for Bentham). The reply to Macaulay's attack upon Mill's essay on *Government* (1829) was written by John Stuart Mill; Macaulay's retort, *The Westminster Reviewer's Defence of Mill*, followed in the same year.

<sup>2</sup> It was published in *The Edinburgh Review* for May 1828, as a notice of Henry Neele's *The Romance of History: England*, and reprinted in vol. 1 of his *Miscellaneous Writings*, posthumously published in 1860. This essay asserts that 'in an ideal history of England Henry VIII could be painted with the skill of a Tacitus'; and 'the skirmishes of the Civil War would be told, as Thucydides could have told them, with perspicuous conciseness.'

and characterisation not to be desirous of reproducing, with their picturesqueness and point, the intensity of feeling which inspired their art, and to take pride in his partisanship as he gloried in his patriotism.

Born in 1800, Macaulay almost grew into manhood with the great events of the second decade of the century, and first took thought of his *History* at the time of one of its greatest political struggles. Sir George Trevelyan's biography of his venerated kinsman, besides bringing home to every reader the truthfulness of its portraiture of a man who justified the opinion formed, in his boyhood, by Hannah More as to the transparent purity and sincerity of his nature, shows that his services to his country and the empire were far from being absorbed in those which, with voice and pen, he rendered to his party; and that, in heart and soul, he was, from first to last, the man of letters whose fame grew into an enduring national possession. The path of distinction opened early for him in literary as well as in political work; to a forensic career, he was not drawn, notwithstanding his oratorical gifts, his marvellous power of memory and what has been well described as his extraordinary sense of the concrete. He was the most indefatigable of workers, both from motives highly honourable to him (he was an excellent son to his father, Zachary Macaulay, a chief pillar of the anti-slavery movement, and, through life, a devoted brother) and from natural disposition, and he could say for himself that 'when I sit down to work I work harder and faster than any person that I ever knew.' In the earlier half of his life, he found himself obliged to earn money to supplement the income from his Trinity fellowship and, subsequently, from his commissionership in bankruptcy; and when, in 1830, he began his *History of England*, he did not think it possible to give himself up to preparation for what might prove an unremunerative task. Thus, though, as it proved, nearly thirty years were yet before him, he abstained from entering at once upon a work which he might still have carried out on a scale such as that which he originally contemplated when fixing the death of George III as ulterior limit; and he became a regular contributor to periodical literature, *Knight's Quarterly Magazine* and *The Edinburgh Review* in particular. An article proposed by him to the latter journal, after a visit to France at the time of the revolution of 1830, having been rejected through the intervention of Brougham (never Macaulay's friend), he planned a history of France from the restoration to the accession of Louis-Philippe, but did not carry it



to quite one hundred printed pages—in which condition it was afterwards discovered. When, in 1834, he accepted a seat on the India council, and, during his residence in India (where he never became domesticated) to 1838, devoted to literature such leisure as he could command, *The Edinburgh Review*, again, gathered its ripe fruits. On his return home, now in possession of a sufficient income, a parliamentary career once more offered itself to him; and, though he had already begun his *History of England*, he, in 1839, accepted office under lord Melbourne. In 1841, the whig ministry fell, and the opportunity of the *History* seemed to have once more arrived; but he turned aside, for the moment, to compose his *Lays of Ancient Rome* (1842)<sup>1</sup>. The volume evinced his approval of Niebuhr's celebrated theory as to the chief source of the history of regal Rome; yet, notwithstanding the applause obtained for it by its martial *impetus* and swing, the artificiality inseparable from such *tours de force* is beyond disguise. It will probably long be loved by the young, and by all for whom graphic force and an easy command of ballad metres constitute poetry. In more experienced readers, it fails, as Mignet observes, to produce the illusion of reality. Macaulay's essays were not republished till 1845. The collection then approved by him contained all his contributions to periodical literature which he decided to preserve in this form, but not all that are of interest from a literary or biographical point of view; and to the essays contained in it has to be added the notable series of articles contributed by him to *The Encyclopaedia Britannica* (on Atterbury, Bunyan, Goldsmith, Johnson and the younger Pitt). His speeches (published, in self-defence, as corrected by himself, in 1854) are touched upon below; the code of Indian criminal procedure, the completion of which was chiefly his work (1837), falls outside our range.

His literary fame rests on his *Essays* and his *History*. The essays, taken as a whole, mark an epoch both in the literature of the essay, and in historical literature. As a rule, they consist of reviews, not of the book of which the title is prefixed to the essay, but of the subject with which the book is concerned, treated from whatever point of view may commend itself to the author. Thus, they are so many detached pieces of political or literary history, or of that combination of both in which Macaulay delighted and excelled, generally taking a narrative form and preferentially enclosed in a biographical framework. The qualities to which they owe their chief attractiveness may, without pedantry, be

<sup>1</sup> See, *ante*, vol. XIII, chap. VI.

described as appertaining to the art, rather than to the science, of history. The style and general manner of treatment rise or fall in accordance with the subject and with the mood of the author, and that to which he desires to dispose the reader—‘historical articles,’ he says himself, ‘may rise to the highest altitude or sink to the levity and colloquial ease of Horace Walpole. This is my theory.’ That he did not carry it out to the full, was due to the limitations of his own literary genius. Character-drawing was his *forte*: he had learnt this from the great masters in verse and prose of his favourite later seventeenth, and earlier eighteenth, centuries, and, at times, seemed almost to better the instruction. As to style, he was capable of gorgeous pomp of speech, of dazzling splendour of rhetorical ornament; to sublimity, he could not rise. His wit was trenchant and, at times, irresistible, and his satiric power was never at a loss; but his humour sometimes lacked delicacy and his sarcasm the more refined shades of irony. His essays have much to charm and even to fascinate; but to the psychological criticism of the later French masters they are strangers.

It would, of course, be a great error to regard Macaulay’s essays as uniformly open to such criticisms as the above; there are, necessarily, great differences between the earlier and the later in a collection extending over something like a score of years. The earliest of the *Edinburgh* articles—that on Milton—at once attracted attention to the new writer. Yet, though the passionate tone both of admiration and of invective in Macaulay’s essay is that of youth, the gorgeous rhetoric and the audacious substitution of paradox for philosophical conclusion are not peculiar to this stage of his productivity. In one of the very last—though not quite the last—of these essays, that on Addison, Macaulay is manifestly master of a mellowness of tone and calm dignity signally appropriate to a subject to which his whole heart went forth. Yet, the same inexhaustible flow of illustration is here, again, accompanied by the same indiscriminate profusion of pre-determined praise and blame—nothing, in literary, or in other, respects, can be too good for Addison, and nothing too bad for Pope. In an extremely acute, though not hyper-sympathetic estimate of Macaulay’s literary qualities, J. Cotter Morison divides the whole body of his essays and other smaller pieces into subject-groups; and, if we accept this distribution, there will hardly be any doubt as to which of these groups bears away the palm. Of the essays on English history, several may rank among his very finest work; and the essayist is on sure ground, and at his best, in

the two essays on Chatham, separated, in their dates of production, by ten years, but forming, together, a biographical whole worthy of its great national theme. There is, however, one other section of the group which calls for even more special attention. These are the two essays on Warren Hastings and on Clive, to both of which historical criticism must take exception in particular points, but in which the genius of the historian for marshalling facts often remote and obscure, and for presenting the whole array with magnificent effect, achieves an almost unprecedented triumph. In the essays on foreign history, Macaulay was less successful; that on Frederick the great had little value before Carlyle, and less afterwards; while the subject of Ranke's *Popes* made too great demands upon Macaulay's powers as a philosophical historian. Finally, while, of the 'controversial' essays, the author himself judiciously thought fit to exclude more than one from republication, the critical, especially if the delightful late essay on Temple and one or two others of a mixed kind are included, form the most numerous series in the collection. Macaulay's power of recalling not only the great figures of literature, but, also, the surroundings and very atmosphere of their lives, will keep such articles as that on Boswell's *Johnson* favourites, though the censure of Croker may be fully discounted and the belief have become general that Boswell was no fool. In the article on Bacon, on the other hand, the essayist was at his worst, and, in the main argument of the philosophical portion of the essay, stands self-condemned. The whole indictment was, at first anonymously, refuted by James Spedding, in *Evenings with a Reviewer, or Macaulay and Bacon* (1848), and, in a more comprehensive sense, by the whole of that distinguished critic's *Life and Letters of Bacon* (1861—74), one of the ablest as well as one of the most elaborate of English biographical monuments. In Macaulay's contributions to *The Encyclopaedia Britannica*, written towards the close of his life, the historical element is dominant; but they show unabated literary power.

When, in 1848, the first two volumes of *The History of England*, to which Macaulay's ever-growing public had looked forward for many years, at last appeared, and were received with unbounded applause, it was already a less extensive plan to which the great achievement would clearly have to be restricted. His hopes of carrying on the work, in the first instance, to the beginning of the *régime* of Sir Robert Walpole—a period of over thirty years—and, thence, peradventure, a century, or even further, beyond, gradually became dreams; and, in the end, he

would have been happy could he have brought down the history consecutively to the death of his hero, William III, instead of the narratives of that event and of the preceding death of James II remaining episodes written in anticipation. After India, parliament and official life had claimed him, and it had not been till 1847 that he had found himself wholly free. In 1849, he declined the professorship of modern history at Cambridge, and, though he returned to parliament in 1852, the broken state of his health determined him, in 1856, to withdraw altogether from public life. In the previous year, vols. III and IV of his *History* had been published and received with great, though no longer unmixed, favour. He had not quite finished his fifth volume before his death, at the end of 1859.

Macaulay's *History* remains a great book, and one of the landmarks of English historical literature, albeit, strictly speaking, but a fragment, and neither without shortcomings nor free from faults. His innate conviction that historical writing is a great art, whose object it is to produce an effect serviceable to virtue and truth by the best use of the materials at its disposal, led him to devote an almost equal measure of assiduous attention to the collection of those materials and to the treatment of them. Research, prosecuted indefatigably, through many years, in the byways quite as diligently as in the highways, among pamphlets and broadsheets, backstairs reports and the rumours of the streets, enabled him to paint pictures of English life and society—more especially the famous general survey which closed the preliminary portion of his *History*—full of colour and variety, to a degree wholly without precedent. Research of the same kind among historians and memoir-writers of an age in which observation of character, a chief heritage of the drama, had been carried to a completeness never reached before supplied the touches and the turns by which he was able to distribute light and shade over his biographical passages and personal portraits, and to impart to his entire narrative a generous and rich colouring like that of the choicest tapestry. At the same time, it cannot be denied that, while, in this never-ending process of research, like a great advocate gifted with the faculty of sweeping everything into his net except what he has no desire to find there, he never lost sight of facts that would be of use and of value to him, he, on occasion, omitted to bring in facts adverse to his conclusions. Hence, he sometimes fell into grievous errors which he was not always at pains to correct when they were pointed out, and which have thus remained as flaws on the surface

of the marble<sup>1</sup>. And, even when there is no question of error, the grandeur of his theme, sometimes, carries him away into a treatment of its main personages, if not of its most important transactions, resistlessly influenced by his sympathies and antipathies. Hence, William of Orange, the hero of the epic, and his unfortunate adversary, James II, are drawn with much the same imaginative partiality.

But, besides Macaulay's inexhaustible store of materials, and the apposite use which his prodigious power of memory enabled him, at all times, to make of them in prompt profusion, other causes contributed to the overwhelming popularity of his *History*. One of these was his power of construction—the arrangement of the narrative and the ordering of its parts and stages. Where else, in our own literature, at all events, shall we find a similar mastery over what may be called the architecture of a great historical work, in which learning, imagination and moral purposes have alike been factors? The art of telling a story—here, the story of a crisis in the destinies of a great nation—depends on this, as well as on the details of composition. In the latter respect, Macaulay's pre-eminence is unchallenged; and generation upon generation will continue to admire the luxuriance of a diction capable of changing suddenly into brief pithy sentences, that follow one another like the march of mailed warriors, and the *vis viva* of a style which enchains the attention of young and old, and wearies only because of an element of iteration in its music. The great whig, protestant and patriotically English *History*, with its grand epical movement, its brilliant colouring and its irresistible spirit of perfect harmony between the writer and his task, is, thus, one of the literary masterpieces of the Victorian age.

<sup>1</sup> The more important criticisms of Macaulay's facts and deductions are enumerated by Sir Leslie Stephen in his article on Macaulay in *D. of N. B.* vol. xxxiv (1893). (See bibliography.) The most comprehensive of these are to be found in John Paget's *New 'Examen'* (1861), supplemented by two additional papers of minor moment. Paget justly observes that Macaulay's habit of citing a number of authorities, frequently without specifying dates or pages, is most trying to the reader who wishes to verify. This way of dealing with evidence is conspicuously misleading in his accounts of Marlborough and of Penn, each of which, as a whole, must be set down as a gross misrepresentation, even if particular objections, such as the confusion of George Penne with William Penn, may be held not to be absolutely proved. In Macaulay's treatment of the problem of responsibility for the massacre of Glencoe, his partisanship is too palpable to allow of the reader being deluded even by the doubtful use made of *Gallienus Redivivus*. The prejudice shown against Claverhouse is more excusable, and the correctness of the picture of the Highlands, although certainly one-sided, is, at least, debatable.

The career of Sir Archibald Alison as a historical writer resembles lord Macaulay's in the rapid (though, in Alison's case, not sudden) rise to abnormal popularity, but differs from it in other respects, and, above all, in the gradual dwindling of his reputation into that of the writer of a useful summary, whose opinions on most subjects may safely be assumed even without consulting him. Alison, herein, again, like Macaulay, was a successful essay-writer as well as historian; in quantity, at least, his contributions to *Blackwood's Magazine* can hardly have been rivalled. In 1829, he planned a history of the first French revolution, partly under the influence of Cléry and Hue's account of the last days of Louis XVI, and still more under that of impressions and ideas which had occupied him since his visit—the first of many—to Paris in 1814. After his *History of Scottish Criminal Law* had appeared in 1832—3, in the latter year the first two volumes of his *History of Europe from 1793 to 1815* followed. He was not daunted by the silence of the great reviews, or by the indifference of most other criticism; and the remaining eight volumes of the work came out at regular intervals—the last being completed by him (with some solemnity) in time for publication on Waterloo day, 1842. Later editions followed, both at home and in the United States; and the work was translated into French, German and Arabic. Its success was unbroken, and, in 1852, he began a *Continuation* of the *History* from 1815 to that year, which he finished in 1859. In spite of the wide popularity of the original work, the *Continuation* met with a cold reception from historical critics and was again strangely ignored where it might have been expected to be congenially welcomed. The researches on which it rested were, necessarily, less extensive than those which had been made by Alison for his earlier volumes: the archives of Europe had scarcely begun to reveal the secret history of these later years. Although, as a whole, the work cannot fairly be said to have fallen flat, its political and social pessimism came to be taken as a matter of course; and the whole of *The History of Europe* is now falling into oblivion. Not the least interesting, though the most prolix, of its author's lesser productions is his (posthumously published) *Autobiography* (to 1862). His life (he long held the sheriffship of Lanarkshire) had been as honourable as it was successful, and singularly attractive in its domestic relations, and he was a good judge of both men and manners.

We saw above how the study of our national history in its foundations, or, in other words, of medieval English history in

its documents, including, in these, the institutions and the language of the people, had begun with Sharon Turner, but that he proved unable to present the results of his labours adequately in an organic historical narrative. Sir Francis Palgrave, who, besides first strongly impressing upon Englishmen the value of this study, by his own example pointed the way to a free original use of the national records by historians of imaginative and constructive power, was a writer to whom the attribute of genius can hardly be denied. Of Jewish extraction (he changed his patronymic Cohen in middle life), he had, while carrying on the work of a solicitor, long been interested in literary and antiquarian studies, and, besides occasionally contributing to the great quarterly reviews, had, in 1818, edited an Anglo-Norman political *chanson*. In 1822, he came forward with a plan for the publication of the records, which met with the approval of the Record commission; and, from 1827 (in which year he was called to the bar, where he was chiefly occupied with pedigree cases) to 1837, he edited for it a series of volumes. In 1831, he brought out a *History of the Anglo-Saxons* (the first volume of a *History of England*) in 'The Family Library,' and, in the following year, *The Rise and Progress of the English Commonwealth*, covering the same period, of which it furnishes a fascinating as well as lucid review. The book, deservedly, had a great success; nor was anything else so good of the kind produced before John Richard Green. In 1834, he published *An Essay on the Original Authority of the King's Council*. In 1837, he proceeded still further in the line of popular treatment in *Truth and Fictions of the Middle Ages: the Merchant and the Friar*. In the next year, he was appointed deputy-keeper of the reconstituted and reorganised Record office. The duties of this post, held by him during the remainder of his long life, he discharged with great zeal and energy, issuing a series of twenty-two annual reports. Of his chief work, *The History of Normandy and of England*, the earlier volumes did not appear till 1851 and 1857 respectively, and the last two not till after his death, which occurred in 1861. He had thus, without either haste or pause, laboured so as to earn for himself a meed of recognition from the historian who was to take up his work in the same field, though from very different points of view. Freeman pronounced<sup>1</sup> Palgrave the first English writer of great original powers who had devoted himself to the early history

<sup>1</sup> In a review of *The History of Normandy and of England* in the London *Guardian* of July 1851, cited in Stephens's *Life and Letters of E. A. Freeman*, vol. 1, p. 116.

of his own country, and judged his faults to spring from the exuberance of a mind of great natural gifts.

Palgrave's treatment of early English history was not only the earliest on a scale commensurate with the importance of the subject; but it, also, was the first attempt, on such a scale, to deduce ruling conclusions from a study of the development of legal principles based on those which controlled the life and conditions of the Roman empire. The monarchical power founded on these conceptions was, as he held, what dominated the growth of the Germanic kingdoms—so that 'Clovis' and Offa were representations of imperial ideas; but, in England, it was the free judicial institutions of the Germanic communities which, in their turn, interfered to prevent these traditions from leading to absolutism, and called forth the beginnings of our constitutional life. Palgrave regarded the series of conquests, usually supposed to have successively changed the essential conditions as well as the forms of our national life, as anything but subversive in their effects; and, even with regard to the English conquest, was confirmed in this view by his paradoxical belief that, for the most part, the Britons were Germanic, not Celtic, in origin—Belgic Kymrys, whose neighbours and kin are to be found on the continent as Saxons and Frisians<sup>1</sup>. This tenet illustrates the occasional audacity of Palgrave's speculations; and the general notion of the dominating influence of the Roman imperial idea reached its height in him, before it was overthrown by the endeavours of the Germanist school<sup>2</sup>, which was in the ascendant before the close of his historical labours. But the inspiring and stimulating effect of those labours has, of late, been undervalued rather than overrated; and an enduring memorial of their value has long been a *desideratum*, which is now in process of being supplied.

The date of John Mitchell Kemble's most important contribution to historical literature was earlier than that of Palgrave's by a year or two; and, in the purpose to which he diverted his researches, he connects himself with the Germanist school rather than with what may be called Palgrave's imperialist tendency. Kemble—though he appears to have known nothing of Waitz—is essentially Germanistic in the groundwork of his teaching; and, in the preface to his best known work, *The*

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Vinogradoff, P., *op. cit.* pp. 11 ff.

<sup>2</sup> For a full statement of the origin and development of this school or group, see *ibid.* pp. 36 ff.



*Saxons in England* (1849), written at a time when the foundations of existing European politics seemed giving way on all sides, declared his opinion that to her institutions and principles of government, bequeathed to her by Teutonic ancestors, England, in a great measure, owed her pre-eminence among nations, her stability and her security. No doubt, this work and, even more so, the *Codex Diplomaticus Aevi Saxonici* by which it was preceded, and the less important collection of later state papers, which followed it, were the productions of an antiquary rather than of a historian; *The Saxons in England* offers a series of dissertations on materials, unwelded into an organic whole. The writer has little interest in the traditions of the conquest as handed down by the *Chronicle* and Bede; what concerns him is the gradual evolution of institutions, mainly of Teutonic origin, although these began to spread among us while Britain was still under Roman dominion, and the population was even more largely Celtic than its lower orders continued to remain. In Kemble's view, the social changes that accompanied the gradual establishment of these institutions were due to the conditions and new forms of landed proprietorship. Kemble, though he had no legal training, like that of certain other English historians of this age, by his study of the charters came to understand that the English system of land laws has an importance for English history not less than the Roman had for that of Rome; and this insight he owed, in the first instance, as he owed his perception of the Germanic origin of that system, to his Old English lore. Rarely has so great and direct a service been rendered to historical science by philological scholarship<sup>1</sup>.

The ruling principles of English historians of the Germanist group found their clearest and most vigorous exponent in Edward Augustus Freeman, the central figure of the Oxford historical school of the Victorian age—unless that title be disputed on behalf of Stubbs, to whom Freeman's loyal friendship would have gladly yielded precedence. In a sense, Freeman's method supplemented Kemble's rather than followed it; for, in technical phrase, it was the written monuments rather than the sources—the records rather than the remains—on which Freeman based the conclusions repeated with unwearying persistency in his numerous books great and small, and in countless essays and reviews. He would not hear of Palgrave's paradox as to the kinship between the Romanised Celts and the English invaders, and attributed to

<sup>1</sup> As to Benjamin Thorpe, see, *ante*, vol. xii, p. 344.

these a conquest which, with the exception of certain parts of the country, meant extirpation. On the other hand, the Norman conquest, of which he became the historian, seemed to him to have brought about no fresh change of an analogous kind, and to have fundamentally affected neither the nature and character of the population, nor the course of the national history. In the consecutive doings of the nation in war and in peace, in its enterprises and exploits as well as in its legislation and system of government in both church and state, its Germanic nature and character manifest themselves. Obviously, however, the historian, whose own interest is restricted to these relations, and who makes no pretence of entering into the social life of the people in any of its aspects save, in a more or less restricted measure, those of language, literature and architecture, omits a strong link in his argument.

Injustice would be done to the force with which Freeman explains and illustrates his general position, were it not added that he calls in the powerful aid of the comparative method, for which he was exceptionally qualified by his acquaintance with much of the medieval history of non-Germanic lands, as well as by his familiarity, noted in an earlier volume of this work<sup>1</sup>, with the history, and the constitutional history in particular, of Greece and Rome. His training as a historical student may, in some respects, have been self-training only, and his advocacy of the principle of the unity of history may have suffered from his lack of intimacy (on which he was wont to insist) with periods which 'were not his own' or to which 'he had not come down.' Yet, through him, comparative history first became a living thing to English students, and the unity which he proclaimed with missionary zeal was gradually accepted as a reality, in spite of the time-honoured nomenclature of the schools<sup>2</sup>.

Freeman's literary activity seems extraordinary even to those who had some personal cognisance of part of it. His historical studies, at first, took a largely archaeological turn, and his early literary efforts consisted, in the main, of contributions to *The Ecclesiastick* and *The Ecclesiologist*, varied by *Poems, legendary and historical*, published in conjunction with G. W. Cox. He was, however, preparing for historical efforts in a wider field; by a fortunate chance, a university prize competition, on the

<sup>1</sup> See, *ante*, vol. XII, chap. XIV.

<sup>2</sup> It was as he listened to Arnold's Oxford lectures, in 1841 and 1842, that the idea of the unity of history first dawned upon the future successor of the historian of Rome in his modern history chair.

effects of the Roman conquest (1845—6), led him to read the works of Thierry, Lingard and Palgrave; and he carried on the study of the subject after he had had 'the good luck not to get the prize.' He was, also, early intent upon the acquisition of a pure and simple style, of which, as a historian, he was certainly master. There was never much grace, and still less play of humour, about what he wrote; but his manner of writing, which he seems, in a measure, to have modelled on Macaulay, was almost always forcible and, in general, dignified; and, at times, he could rise to a certain grandeur free from dogmatic admixture.

Although long interested in the question of the study of history at Oxford, and author of a series of lectures published under the title *History and Conquests of the Saracens* and of an earlier *History of Architecture*, besides having become, from about the year 1860 onwards, one of the pillars of *The Saturday Review*, it was not till a little later that he reached the full height of his powers as a historian. His reviews and other articles in weeklies (*The Saturday* and *The Guardian* in particular), as well as in monthlies and quarterlies, are, to a large extent, and where their intent was not essentially controversial, chips from the block at which he was working—of the same material and texture, homogeneous with his chief books in life and thought, and little differentiated from them in style. His pen was, in fact, as much his own in his journalistic as in his other productions—in other words, his periodical articles, though, for the most part, unsigned, invariably presented his own opinions<sup>1</sup>. His literary activity, especially from 1859 onwards, was simply astounding<sup>2</sup>.

In 1863, before he had completed the preparations for his *Norman Conquest*, he brought out the first and, as it proved, the only volume of a work which, had it been carried out on the lines he had laid down for himself, might have become, in his younger friend lord Bryce's words, 'a very great book,' and which, as it is, has been, by some, more highly prized than any other of his writings. *The History of Federal Government*, which Freeman had designed as a comparative history of federalism in ancient Greece, in the medieval foundation of the Swiss confederation, in

<sup>1</sup> He broke off his long connection with *The Saturday Review* when he came to differ from the general views of that journal on near-Eastern politics. His Hellenic sympathies had confirmed him in opinions at which he had arrived after much reflection, and, from the time when he published (in *The Edinburgh* for April 1857) his article entitled *The Greek People and the Greek Kingdom*, they never wavered through good or evil report.

<sup>2</sup> See dean Stephens's excellent *Life and Letters* for details.

the intermediate growth of the united provinces of the Netherlands and of the Hansa and in the modern creation of the United States of America, was, however, not carried beyond the earliest of these stages<sup>1</sup>. He soon came back to his first love, if, with his power of duplicating his tasks, he had ever swerved from it. The appearance, in 1865, of his *Old English History for Children*—children of twenty-four, it was, with some point, remarked—showed in what direction he was again concentrating his labours and the travels which accompanied them; and, in 1867, the first volume of *The History of the Norman Conquest* was actually published<sup>2</sup>. The last volume (the fifth) did not appear till 1876.

Freeman's *Norman Conquest* accomplished what Palgrave had planned, but only partially carried out. Into the later work, mistakes may have found their way, even into salient passages of the narrative, and into the account of the tragic catastrophe of Senlac itself; and its general effect may suffer from a certain lengthiness of which few historians writing on such a scale have been able altogether to free themselves—least of all Freeman, who had accustomed himself to the privilege of having his say out. But any such objections are cast into the shade by the merits of the work. It is admirably arranged on a converging plan, which, in the second volume, brings the reader to the reign of Edward the Confessor, so far as the banishment and death of earl Godwine, the real hero of the tale; while the affairs of Normandy are brought up to William's first visit to England, and thence, to Edward's death and the coronation of Harold, the second hero of the story. Volume III relates the conquest proper with epic breadth, and volume IV the reign of William in England. Finally, in volume V, the history of the Norman kings is summarised to the death of Stephen and the coronation of Henry II, and chapters follow on the political results of the Norman conquest, and its effects on language, literature and architecture. The narrative, which closes with a summary of the Angevin reigns, is enriched by a series of excursions on particular points and episodes, on geographical sites and local remains. Lucid in arrangement, the work nowhere fails to manifest the

<sup>1</sup> Cf., *ante*, vol. XII, pp. 315—316.

<sup>2</sup> In 1869, Freeman began his *Historical Geography*; but it was not published till eleven years later. The idea of the work was excellent, and had not hitherto been elaborated in an English form. As to the execution, of parts of the work, at all events, opinions differ. Perhaps, his general historical knowledge was not of the minute sort required for working out the details of the plan.

spirit in which it was composed—that of a lofty patriotism inseparable from an ardent love of freedom. His Swiss studies reflected themselves in several passages of *The Norman Conquest*; and he became ‘more and more convinced of the absolute identity of all the old Teutonic constitutions.’ Thus, he was fortified in his contention that the Norman conquest left the free national life of England, in its essentials, unchanged.

In 1882, Freeman published *The Reign of William Rufus and the Accession of Henry I*, thus carrying out the design which he had in his mind when summarising these passages of English history in the last volume of his *Norman Conquest*. Here, again, the narrative involved a twofold task; its main interest, however, lay in ecclesiastical affairs, a field with which he took pleasure in occupying himself, but which had also engaged the attention of other eminent historians. These volumes ended his labours on the Norman conquest of England; but, although he never composed his contemplated life of Henry I, he did not abandon the subject of the Norman conquests in Europe. ‘Palermo follows naturally on Winchester and Rouen.’ But, of his sojourns in Sicily, and of his history of that island, which he was also to leave half-told, we have already spoken<sup>1</sup>. In 1884, Freeman at last found himself in the chair of modern history at Oxford; but this acknowledgment of his eminence as a historian came too late—at least too late for him to fit his teaching into the system of historical instruction then flourishing in his university. This was a mortification to him; for no man of letters or learning ever bestowed more attention on the academical, as well as on the political, ecclesiastical and county administrative, life around him. Still, his actual work as a historian remained, to the last, the determining interest of his life; and, in the midst of the prosecution of it, death overtook him on the Spanish coast, at Alicante, in March 1892.

In the death of Freeman, English historical literature suffered a most severe loss. He had many great qualities—with, perhaps, the defects of some of them; but these failings were most palpable in controversy, in the conduct of which he lacked a due sense of proportion, and was apt to become tiresome, and, at times, unjust. As to his general historical manner, he has been frequently charged with pedantry; but there is some element of misapprehension in the cavil. For, though his habit of reiteration (deliberately adopted) added to the positiveness of his manner, and thus imparted even

<sup>1</sup> *Ante*, vol. xii, chap. xiv, p. 316.

to passages of his *Histories* too strongly dogmatic a flavour, he was always perfectly clear and to the point, and declared that 'history has no technical terms'—adding that he had sometimes wished it had, 'to frighten away fools.' He was apt to be lengthy, and lord Bryce once told him that he had caught too much of the manner of the cxixth Psalm; but he was not diffuse by nature. It was the cause—the cause of truth—which led him to spare no man or interest or opinion, and, least of all, to spare himself.

The close association of the names of Freeman and Stubbs, and, with theirs, of that of a third but younger Oxford historian, John Richard Green, was, at one time, a frequent theme of academical jest; but, indeed, nothing would have been stranger than that a bond of intimate intellectual sympathy should have failed to unite men who, in the same age, devoted themselves to the study and exposition of the national history, if not always from the same point of view, at all events on a common basis of historical principles and with the same purpose of proving the continuity of the national life. And, certainly, the recognition in English historical literature of that continuity was signally advanced by their fellowship.

William Stubbs, successively bishop of Chester and of Oxford, was Freeman's junior by two years only, but made his mark as a historical writer nearly a decade later than his friend. For some years, however, before the publication of his chief contribution to English constitutional history, Stubbs, who, from 1850, lived a life of tranquillity in his Essex rectory Navestock, enjoyed a high reputation with those interested in the progress of the Rolls series. To this collection, begun in 1857, he contributed, in 1858, *Registrum Sacrum Anglicanum*, an endeavour to exhibit the course of episcopal succession in England. By inclination and habit, he was an antiquary, who came to interest himself more especially in chronology and genealogy; but he edited perhaps the most important of the publications undertaken for the series, the *Itinerarium* and the *Epistolae Cantuarienses* of the reign of Richard I, besides many others, including the *Gesta Regis Henrici* of Benedict of Peterborough (1867) and *Memorials of St Dunstan* (1874), for which he wrote luminous prefaces, displaying both independence of judgment and high literary quality. In 1866, having previously held the librarianship at Lambeth, Stubbs was appointed by the earl of Derby to the modern history chair at Oxford; and having, as he said, been for seventeen years a country parson, he now became for eighteen years an Oxford professor. In

neither capacity did he allow himself any respite in his historical labours, steadily pursuing those lines of study to which he was attracted by the highest motives, never concealed by him. His principal achievement in the department of ecclesiastical history was *The Councils and Ecclesiastical Documents of Great Britain and Ireland*, edited by him in conjunction with A. W. Haddan (1871—8); in the same connection may be mentioned, though they were of later date, his five *Appendices* to the *Report of the Commission on Ecclesiastical Courts*, drawn up in 1883 after attendance on seventy-five meetings of the commission.

In 1870, Stubbs first came before a wider public, and earned the gratitude of students of English constitutional history by arranging and editing *Select Charters and other Illustrations of English Constitutional History* (to the reign of Edward I). The introductory notes to this volume, together with the opening sketch of the evolution on which the collection was intended to throw light, are models of succinct and luminous exposition. This book, which is not likely to fall out of use, was followed, in 1874—8, by *The Constitutional History of England in its Origin and Development*, which has long been regarded as the accepted guide to a study signally advanced by it. The subject of the work, the evolution of English institutions from Old English times to the beginning of the Tudor monarchy, where Hallam had begun his investigations, is treated after a full and comprehensive fashion, military history, and what may be called foreign politics, being excluded. Inevitably, conceptions of English constitutional history which still commended themselves to Stubbs have been changed or have vanished in the course of the period during which his work has, on the whole, held its ground; the mark theory, the stand-by of the older Germanistic school, has been so greatly modified as to have been, in a large measure, abandoned, and, according to its actual meaning, *Magna Carta* is no longer held by trained historians to secure the right of trial by jury to every Englishman. Many points and passages of English constitutional history, too, which have been cleared up by more recent enquiry—the whole relations of the forest to English life, and the true story of the rising of 1381—have recently been shown to have been insufficiently treated by Stubbs<sup>1</sup>. But, just as Stubbs's work is comprehensive in its range and purpose, rather than specially

<sup>1</sup> See Petit-Dutaillis, C., *Studies and Notes supplementary to Stubbs's Constitutional History*, parts I and II (originally published as notes to the French translation of the work); English translation by Rhodes, W. E., Manchester, 1908—14.

concerned with particular or novel points, so its value is dependent on the solidity and effectiveness with which the main historical position is worked out—the sober and moderate position that

the English constitution is the result of administrative conception in the age of the Normans of local self-government found in the age of the Saxons<sup>1</sup>.

Thus, it is a work which admits of being improved without being discarded, and which it would be folly, because of its inevitable deficiencies, to cast aside as out of date.

John Richard Green, though of a younger generation than either Freeman or Stubbs, was not only, in his labours, closely associated with both, but, to Freeman, he stood in a relation of intimacy which made the younger man the chosen companion, philosopher and friend of the older, while he was regarded with an almost equally affectionate, if, perhaps, more critical, interest by Stubbs, who, from the first, gave much attention to the design of *A Short History of the English People*. On the morrow of the actual publication of this book, Green (really very wideawake already) awoke to find himself famous; and Stubbs pronounced that he 'knew no one who had the same grasp of the subject and the same command of details combined.' Himself the most accurate of writers, he was not in the least perturbed by the onslaughts made on Green's incidental lapses. The previous literary career of the author of *A Short History* had been that of a periodical writer of extraordinary freshness and ability. In none of his contributions to *The Saturday Review* (which extended from 1867 to 1872, with one or two later articles) was he so successful as in the half-descriptive, half-historical 'middles,' which species Freeman, more or less, had originated, but which, in Green's hands, was brought to a mastery not reached by anyone but himself: these were afterwards republished under the title *Studies from England and Italy* (1876). In addition, he wrote a number of 'social' middles, which flowed spontaneously from his facile pen, and were, in part, reminiscences of clerical life in its humorous, as well as in its serious, aspects. He had quitted Oxford 'with the full intention of becoming the historian of the church of England,' and it was through a lecture on Dunstan that he first arrested Freeman's attention. His design was, characteristically, changed into that of the history of the development of Christian civilisation in England, and, before very long, into first

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Vinogradoff, *op. cit.* pp. 23—24.



thoughts of a short history with a still more comprehensive scope. Soon after the first forming of this plan, he was made aware of the seeds in him of an all but incurable disease.

Still only gradually, he made up his mind to devote the span of life which might be his to the writing of history; and it was to English history that he felt he had a clear calling. Other schemes and occupations were laid or left aside; he resigned his London incumbency; and, while spending successive winter seasons in Italy, gave himself up altogether to his task. In 1874, *A Short History of the English People* appeared, and met with a success unprecedented since the days of Macaulay. The extraordinary popularity of this book is not due altogether to Green's narrative and descriptive power—which always addresses itself to the relations of the scene to the human actors in it—and to the wonderful brightness of the work. It is, also, due to his recognition of all the elements in the national life which contributed to the progress of the national history, and, especially, of the intimate connection between the political, economical and social and the literary and artistic life of the people. And, above all, it is due to the sympathetic pulse which beats in every page, and which is more than anywhere else noticeable where he gives expression to his immense and indignant interest, almost recalling that of the psalmist, in the poor.

The treatment of the several sections of Green's *Short History* shows inequalities, and the narrative is not free from blemishes of taste as well as errors of fact, to which the author was prepared to plead guilty; for, notwithstanding the buoyancy of his spirits and the vivacity of his conversation, the genuine modesty of Green revealed itself to all who knew him otherwise than superficially. The book was not really well-suited for the purposes of a school-book, to which it was largely applied; but, though the student of English history who remains a stranger to the work is not to be congratulated, it has satisfied higher ends than those of mere imparting of knowledge. That it assisted greatly in spreading and sustaining a living interest in our national past, and in making it intelligible as an organic whole of which the working continues, cannot be doubted; and rarely has a single-minded ambition been more swiftly or more amply fulfilled.

Aided by the devotion of his wife, Green lived to produce two distinct elaborations of parts of the theme of his *Short History*, entitled respectively *The Making*, and *The Conquest, of England*. It was in these branches of his studies that he was specially able

to apply his power of tracing and delineating the geographical aspects of national historical growth, with which no other historian had dealt so fully and so ably before him. He died, in his forty-sixth year, at Mentone, after a heroic struggle against the disease to which he succumbed.

Of later English historical scholars who have taken a conspicuous part in examining the foundations of medieval political and social life, without confining themselves to this field of research and exposition, our mention must be of the briefest. The writings of Sir Henry Maine belong to legal and political, rather than to historical, literature, and his great reputation as a philosophical jurist, due, in the first instance, to his work entitled *Ancient Law* and strengthened by his legislative services as legal member of the council of India, rose to its height when, after his return home, he successively held two important professorial chairs—of jurisprudence and of international law. His lectures entitled *Village Communities in the East and West* (1871) developed, with a breadth and luminousness peculiar to the author and on a comparative basis largely supplied by his knowledge of India in especial, the conclusions of Maurer and Nasse. A second course, entitled *The Early History of Institutions* (1875), applied the same method to a still more extensive field of research. His lectures on international law, which entered into the question of arbitration as a preventive of war, Maine, unfortunately, did not live to see through the press. His method was a remarkably attractive one; but he lacked the time, and, perhaps, the inclination, for the closer investigation required for a historical treatment of certain of his subjects.

To economic history proper is to be assigned the best known voluminous work of James Edwin Thorold Rogers, *A History of Agriculture and Prices in England from 1259 to 1793* (1866—1902); but he was also well seen in general political history, and was a friend and follower of Cobden. His *Protests of the Lords* (1875) is an interesting, as well as a valuable, piece of work. The social history and life of the English peasantry, in his own East Anglia, was the subject of a study by Augustus Jessopp, which, under the name *Arcady for better for worse* (1887), attracted wide attention; he was an ecclesiastical historian of learning and breadth of view, and lived a long and unselfish scholar's life.

The subject of English village communities was specially studied by Frederic Seebohm, who died in 1912. So far back as 1867, he

had first become known to students of English history by an attractive volume entitled *The Oxford Reformers of 1498—Colet, Erasmus and More*—which renders full justice to Colet's share in the renaissance movement on the basis of the letters of his whole-hearted friend and admirer Erasmus. But the researches which, at a later date, he carried on during his long residence in Hertfordshire, and of which the first published result was his well-known book *The English Village Community* (1882), had reference to problems of early land-tenure and of the social system evolved from it which largely occupied the minds of medievalists in our own and other countries, and which represent a reaction from the theory of the Germanic origin of the village community to that of its primary indebtedness to Roman influence. Seebohm's investigations were not confined to English, but afterwards extended, in particular, to Welsh, conditions of life.

In Frederic William Maitland, who, after a brilliant, but all too short, career as teacher of English law and writer on English legal history, was taken away when at the height of his intellectual powers, his contemporaries, as of one accord, had come to recognise a foremost authority on the studies with which he had identified himself. Rarely has a more modest self-estimate (he judged himself, for instance, incapable of narrative history) coexisted with more fascinating mental and personal qualities, more penetrating insight into theory, a rarer art of illustrating it by the use of practical example and a quicker and pleasanter wit. His power of epigram was considerable, and imparts a delightful spontaneous sparkle to his writings on subjects in the treatment of which few readers expect diversion to be blended with instruction<sup>1</sup>. He had inherited from his grandfather, Samuel Roffey Maitland, a vivid interest in English history and a thorough independence of judgment<sup>2</sup>. After giving himself up at Cambridge to philosophical reading, he had, during eight years, acquired a full experience of the practice of the law, but preferred its historical side, and further equipped himself for the work of his life by an assiduous study of continental legal history. Savigny's influence was,

<sup>1</sup> See, for some illustrations, Smith, A. L., *Frederic William Maitland* (1908).

<sup>2</sup> S. R. Maitland, who during part of his life was librarian at Lambeth, in an early work on the Albigenses and Waldenses (1832), treated the pretensions of Joseph Milner's *Church History* with much contempt, and, in later publications, attacked both him and Foxe, the author of *The Book of Martyrs*. The elder Maitland's numerous contributions to *The British Magazine*, of which he became editor, gave much offence to the evangelical party; but they have gained high praise both by their learning and by their force of style. See bibliography.

necessarily, very strong upon him, and he began a translation of the great *Geschichte des römischen Rechts im Mittelalter* which he never completed. As the purpose of his labours gradually shaped itself in his mind, and he resolved upon accomplishing for the history of English, what Savigny had achieved for that of Roman, law, he perceived the necessity of associated effort, if this end was to be reached. He thus became the founder, and, afterwards, the director, of the Selden society, to whose publications he contributed nearly half of those issued in his lifetime. The history of common law had never been taken in hand after Bracton and Blackstone; and the very language of the law of the later middle ages had been left without dictionary or grammar<sup>1</sup>.

Maitland did not claim to be a palaeographer; but he taught himself by teaching others, and came to be esteemed an expert on MSS and in the criticism of texts<sup>2</sup>. In his own first important production, *Bracton's Notebook* (1887), he claimed for a British Museum MS the character of a collection of materials for the famous treatise *De Legibus et Consuetudinibus Angliae*. By such researches as these, many of which were published by the Selden society, and the whole range of which his paper entitled *The Materials for English Legal History*<sup>3</sup> showed him to have under his ken, he prepared himself for the publication, in conjunction with his friend Sir Frederick Pollock, of their *History of the English Law before the Time of Edward I* (1895). This book, which at once took rank as the standard authority on its subject, deals chiefly with the latter part of the twelfth, and with the thirteenth, centuries—'a luminous age throwing light on both past and future.' But Maitland's attention was by no means absorbed by this period of the laws and institutions of England. His essays entitled *Domesday Book and Beyond* belong to a relatively late date in his career (1897), and touch on debatable ground. In his Selden volume *Bracton and Azo* (1895), he had discussed the relations between English law and the *corpus juris* to which, indirectly if not directly, the English judge had been held to be deeply indebted. The general subject of these relations possessed the greatest interest for him, and connected itself with the special question of English canon law, which he discussed in six essays entitled *Roman Canon Law in the Church of England*. Much

<sup>1</sup> See Maitland's chapter (xx) in vol. 1 of the present work, 'The Anglo-French Law Language.'

<sup>2</sup> See his introduction to the edition of *The Mirror of Justice* by his friend Whittaker, W. J. (Selden society's publications, vol. v).

<sup>3</sup> I, II, in *The Political Science Quarterly* (New York, 1889).

controversy followed, and Maitland briefly reverted to the subject in the course of a very judicious contribution to *The Cambridge Modern History*<sup>1</sup> entitled 'The Anglican Settlement and the Scottish Reformation.' His Rede lecture (1901) entitled *English Law and the Renaissance*, with its humorous half-outlook on the future, will not easily be forgotten.

His reputation as a teacher had long been established; so far back as 1887, he had delivered a course of lectures entitled *The Constitutional History of England*, which extends over five periods from the death of Edward I to the present day, and, though analytical in form, combines, with a clear statement of principles, an abundance of illustration, while showing a wonderful alertness and ability of, as it were, entering into the minds of his hearers. The course was not published till 1908, and furnishes the fittest memorial of Maitland's capacity as a lecturer. The Oxford *Ford Lectures* (1898) dealt with the growth and definition of the idea of a corporation, an abstraction admitting of being rendered impressive by means of concrete illustrations, such as always had a peculiar fascination for him. In his last years, in the face of obstacles such as few scholars have braced themselves to resist and overcome, Maitland continued to read and write, even in his distant winter home. He proved his literary skill in a charming life of Leslie Stephen; but, most of his time was, when possible, given to *The Year Books of Edward II* (1307—10)—a series begun late by him but carried through three successive volumes. These monuments take the student back straight into the middle ages, whose life they conjure up out of the dust of the law-courts. Maitland's introduction to the first volume could only have been written by one who had acquired a complete intimacy with his material.

With Maitland's work that of Mary Bateson is closely connected, although it was to Creighton that she owed the impulse to historical research. As a medievalist, she more especially occupied herself with monastic and municipal history; her earliest writings, including an article entitled *The Origin and Early History of Double Monasteries*, belonged to the former field of study; and she edited *Records of the Borough of Leicester*, *The Charters of the Borough of Cambridge* (with Maitland, 1901) and two volumes entitled *Borough Customs* in the publications of the Selden society. Her papers entitled *The Laws of Breteuil* showed her original power of dealing with the sources of municipal

<sup>1</sup> Vol. II, chap. XVI (1903).

institutions, and she had thoroughly trained herself in medieval bibliography. Whatever subject she treated, she wrote on it with simplicity, directness and independence of judgment—qualities which were part of her nature.

Among historical scholars of mark whose original work was largely based on their labours at the Record office, John Sherren Brewer and James Gairdner should be mentioned together. The former, after having, in his earlier days, been subject to the influence of the Oxford movement, was much associated with F. D. Maurice, whom he succeeded in his chair at King's college, London. He made his mark as a writer in connection with the earlier instalments of a work on which he remained engaged during the whole of the latter part of his life—the calendaring, for the Rolls series, of the state papers of Henry VIII, in a succession of volumes to which he furnished introductions, published posthumously as a separate work, *The Reign of Henry VIII to the death of Wolsey*, under the editorship of Gairdner. Brewer enjoyed a widespread reputation as a high-minded and trustworthy historian, and as an accomplished and many-sided man of letters. He did not profess to be writing a history of the reign of Henry VIII; but his few introductions, together, amount to what is much more than a digest of the transactions of the period—a survey of it by a writer of extensive reading and remarkably clear judgment. His editions of works of authors among whom are both Roger and Francis Bacon, and his ever-welcome contributions to *The Quarterly Review*, posthumously collected under the title *English Studies*, sufficiently exhibit the intellectual versatility of the least dry-as-dust of archivists.

James Gairdner, who was a public servant at the Record office for more than half a century, used to say that what he knew he had taught himself; and no scholar has ever passed through a more conscientious training. He carried on Brewer's *Calendar of Letters and Papers of the Reign of Henry VIII* to its completion in twenty-one volumes, further edited the documents of the preceding two reigns, together with chronicles and other monuments, and, in 1872—5, produced a standard edition of *The Paston Letters*. But he, also, made many original contributions to the study of English history, which were published in divers collective works, and reprinted in his own and James Spedding's *Studies in English History* (1881); and, in addition to a remarkably fair and by no means paradoxical, *Life of*

*Richard III*, produced a short and equally original biographical estimate of Henry VII. The remainder of his writings are concerned with ecclesiastical history. Long studies in this field of research had matured in him conclusions as to the English reformation and its precursors, differing, in many respects, from current protestant opinion, but always resting on a careful and well-considered treatment of authorities. The editor of the nearly finished (fourth) volume left behind him by Gairdner of his *Lollardy and the Reformation* considers that, in writing the section of *The History of the English Church*, of which Gairdner's later work was an unfinished enlargement, he (though already at an advanced age) believed himself to be fulfilling a duty<sup>1</sup>; and he, certainly, had the cause of truth at heart. His sympathies, at the same time, were strongly on the side of authority, as is evident from his earlier essays on the Lollards, as well as from that entitled *The Divine Right of Kings*<sup>2</sup>.

Before we pass on to the treatment of later periods of English history, we pause at the name of James Anthony Froude. He holds a position so peculiar to himself in our historical literature that it is difficult to assign to his name its appropriate position in an enumeration of our principal nineteenth century writers on history. His true place would be near that of Carlyle; whom, during the greater part of his literary life, he consciously followed as his master, whose way of looking at history he made his own, and the biography of whom was among the noteworthiest of his books. He had begun to write with quite other models before his eyes; but, although he very early disengaged himself from the controlling influence of Newman, it impressed itself, if upon nothing else in him, upon his style as a writer. His contribution to *Lives of the English Saints*—a life of St Neot, erstwhile prince Athelstan of Kent—undertaken at Newman's request, is chiefly remarkable for the effect on the writer of the requisite investigation of his subject; but it, also, shows his interest in history, and English history especially, as a desirable university study, of which he thinks the statute-book might (perhaps in an abridged form) usefully be made a foundation. Then came the intellectual

<sup>1</sup> See W. Hunt's preface to vol. iv of *Lollardy and the Reformation* (1904), p. ix.

<sup>2</sup> Reprinted in vol. i of the *Studies* mentioned above, which contains, together with Spedding's review of the conduct of James I in connection with the Overbury affair, a contribution by Gairdner to the history of Lollardy, *The Historical Element in Shakespeare's Falstaff*. Students of the first two Lancaster reigns owe a great debt to the labours of James Hamilton Wylie, whose *History of the Reign of Henry V* was, in substance, completed before his death.

experiences which put an end to his connection with academical, and with clerical, work<sup>1</sup>, and in the midst of which he found a friend in Kingsley (to whose sister-in-law, the Argemone of *Yeast*, he gave his hand). In 1849, he was introduced to Carlyle; and, soon afterwards, he settled down to a literary life at Plas Gwynant in Wales and Bideford in Devon. Here, he began, and carried on during many years, his *History of England from the Fall of Wolsey*, which, first intended to reach to the death of Elizabeth, actually closed with the dissipation of the Spanish Armada.

The earliest sample of the spirit and style in which Froude addressed himself to his task had been a recapitulation, published in *The Westminster Review* (1852) under the title *England's Forgotten Worthies*, of certain original narratives of a daring and adventurous sort. That the seed thus sown did not fall on barren ground is shown by the fact that the paper inspired in Kingsley the idea of *Westward Ho!* and supplied Tennyson with the theme of *The Revenge*. That this stirring article breathed the antipathies as well as the sympathies that were to mark the forthcoming *History*, suggests itself from the terse description of king James I as 'the base son of a bad mother.' But, though Froude's reputation already stood high in a chosen circle of friends, and, though Carlyle watched the progress of the *History* with genuine interest—he may, indeed, be said to have been largely responsible for its central idea, the insufficiency of any but extraordinary men (such as Henry VIII, in the first instance) for the management and direction of extraordinary times—the success of the book must have taken its author by surprise. He was too intent upon his own aims and, also, in the right sense, too much of a man of the world, to pay much attention to either praise or blame; but, that a historical work of such amplitude should command the interest of a wide public, while Macaulay's *History* was still in progress, and that a book which could not but offend many, and startle more, should sustain this interest throughout its voluminous course, was, certainly, a very uncommon literary experience. Beyond a doubt, the primary cause accounting for this result must be sought in the style and method of the writer. Froude's style combined fullness of matter with charm of manner; for his study of original

<sup>1</sup> *The Nemesis of Faith* (1849) (intended by Froude as a 'tragedy') was widely accepted as having a didactic purpose and containing the confession of his own faith. Cf., *ante*, vol. XII, p. 292.



documents both at home and abroad (notably at Simancas) was most assiduous. His form of narrative was Herodotean rather than Thucydidean; but the British reading public, especially since its literary appetite has been fed largely on fiction, likes breadth of exposition, and Froude's long paraphrases of original documents commended themselves to readers in search of the real. His method was, intentionally, the reverse of scientific; 'there seems, indeed,' he wrote<sup>1</sup>, 'something incongruous in the very connexion of such words as Science and History.' His own style, beyond a doubt, is all but irresistible to those who enjoy the union of facility of form with wealth of colouring; and in variety of invective he is unsurpassed, at least among writers whose good taste is only exceptionally overpowered by sentiment<sup>2</sup>.

This is not the place in which to revive the memory of the attacks which, during its progress, were made upon Froude's *History*, certainly one of the best-abused books of any age of literature. Besides long and severe charges of partisan misstatement, brought by representative historical writers against his treatment of the monasteries question and of other important topics, he was, from the first, exposed to a running fire of hostile criticism on the part of *The Saturday Review*; and, from 1864 onwards, these censures grew into a systematic assault, which even the friends of E. A. Freeman, who was mainly responsible for it, would have gladly seen brought to a speedier end. These attacks, which, excessive and, occasionally, even erroneous though they were, proved fatal to Froude's reputation as a historian, had their origin, partly in differences of ecclesiastical opinion, but, mainly, in faults that were, or had become, engrained in his historical writing—looseness of statement, incorrectness of quotation and constant bias of opinion and sentiment. The true charge to be brought against him lies, not in his neglect of authorities, but in the perversity, conscious or unconscious, of his use of them. And this, again, was due, not so much to a preconceived partisanship, as to a conviction that the truth lay, away from popular notions, in the conclusions at which he had independently, and, sometimes, paradoxically, arrived. The uprightness of Henry VIII and the wickedness of those who stood in his way, or in that of the movement which Henry fitted into his policy, had to be proved *coûte que coûte*; and proved, in this sense, it was, to Froude's

<sup>1</sup> See 'The Scientific Method Applied to History,' in *Short Studies*, vol. II.

<sup>2</sup> The list of animals to whom Mary queen of Scots is, in turn, compared in Froude's *History*, is that of a small menagerie.

own—and to Kingsley's—satisfaction. Of queen Elizabeth, in his later volumes, he declined to make a heroine; and, if they have a central figure, it is Burghley's, unless it be Burghley's archfoe, 'far away' beyond the seas and mountains.

Froude's later works on historical subjects did not add to his reputation as a historian; but nothing that he wrote could fail to attract attention, and little to provoke controversy. *The English in Ireland in the Eighteenth Century* (1872—4) grew out of lectures delivered in America concerning a people whom, in a way, Froude liked, but on whose national life he looked with scornful bitterness. No other of his books met with more convincing rejoinders, among which Lecky's<sup>1</sup> is the most notable. His later Spanish studies on the topics of one of the earliest, and of one of the latest, episodes in his *History*, uphold the conclusions there reached. To the brief period of his Oxford professorship (in which, in 1892, he succeeded Freeman) belong *The Life and Letters of Erasmus*, *English Seamen in the Sixteenth Century* and *The Council of Trent* (1894—6). The first-named of these, although good reading, both where it is Erasmus and where it is Froude, did not escape the usual fate of his writings.

Froude, whose productivity had never ceased either during or after his editorship of *Fraser's Magazine* (1860—74)—most of his best occasional contributions to which are included in his delightful *Short Studies* (1867)—was, for many years, one of the most conspicuous figures in the English world of letters. In 1874, he definitely entered into that of politics. After his return to England, he continued to take an active interest in affairs, both Irish and colonial, and visited, in turn, the Australian colonies and the West Indies, describing both expeditions in books which caused almost as much ferment as anything previously written by him. But the chief literary productions of his later years were those bearing on his great friend and master, Carlyle<sup>2</sup>. The second of these, his *History of the first Forty Years of Carlyle's Life*, together with its predecessor, the *History of Carlyle's Life in London*, remains, for better and for worse, one of the most interesting of English biographies.

Proceeding from Froude to the historian who declined to become his successor at Oxford, we pass not only from the study of the Tudor to that of the Stewart age. Among writers on modern history—and on modern English history in particular—no higher

<sup>1</sup> In vol. II of his *History of England in the Eighteenth Century*.

<sup>2</sup> See *ante*, vol. XIII, chap. I.

praise is due to any writer of the century than should be accorded to Samuel Rawson Gardiner, if the supreme criterion be absolute devotion, not only in the letter but in the spirit, to historical truth, and if this be held to show itself in a fairness of judgment that takes into account, with the circumstances and conditions in which men of the past, great or ordinary, lived and acted, those in which they thought and felt. Gardiner was not, and, if his method of composition be taken into account, hardly could be, a brilliant writer ; as with his lecturing, so his written narrative seemed to spin itself continuously out of a full store of maturely considered facts and necessary comments, reaching, without strain, the end of chapter or volume, as of lecture or course.

When he resolved to write the history of the great English revolution of the seventeenth century, he was not bound to the service of any political or religious party, or under any personal obligation beyond that of making his living. In 1856 and 1858, respectively, he became, as he continued through life, unless his necessary lecturing and teaching interfered, a regular reader at the British Museum and the Record office ; and, from that time forward, the principal purpose of his strenuous labours was the writing of his *History*. But he knew that an account of the revolution must be based on an examination of its causes ; and, thus, he began with preparing his *History of England from the Accession of James I to the Disgrace of Chief Justice Coke*, which appeared in 1863. In the previous year, he had brought out, for the Camden society, a documentary volume entitled *Parliamentary Debates in 1610*. Henceforth, his great work advanced by regular instalments of two volumes, till it had arrived at the threshold of the Civil war, when a completed section was republished, in ten volumes, as *The History of England from 1603 to 1640*. Its second part, the history of the revolution proper, made its appearance in two successive subsections, of which the second carried the history of the commonwealth and protectorate to the year 1656, an additional chapter dealing with the parliamentary elections of that year being published posthumously. Thus, by a hard fate, he was unable to finish his great task. But, up to the point actually reached, it had been accomplished, without faltering or failure, in accordance with the original plan and with the mastery over material which, throughout, had marked his work.

Gardiner's *History of England*, though pursuing a chronological method, is in no sense annalistic in either conception or

treatment. As Firth, who continued the work, says, Gardiner 'did not confine himself to relating facts, but traced the growth of the religious and constitutional ideas which underlay' the greatest political conflict ever known to these islands. Firth is equally justified in dwelling on the completeness with which his predecessor treated the different parts of his theme, neglecting neither the military and naval, nor the economic and social, sides of the national development. Gardiner made no pretence of tracing literary or artistic growth, though his remarks on Milton and those on Massinger show that it was not only the political element in their writings which called forth his interest.

Throughout his occupation with his chief work, Gardiner found, or made, time for the production of much useful historical literature of an unpretentious sort, besides rendering services of high value to the Camden and other historical societies, and as contributor to collective historical undertakings of various kinds. His little volume entitled *The Thirty Years' War*, together with his Camden society volumes, *Letters and Documents illustrating the Relations between England and Germany, 1618—20*, show how exceptionally he was qualified to become the historian of a struggle destined, as it would seem, to remain without a fully adequate historical treatment of all its component parts. Gardiner's lectures delivered at Oxford in 1896 under the title *Cromwell's Place in History*, admirably exemplify his manner as a teacher. With the great Protector, he claimed some family connection; but, of Cromwell, as of every other character of the past, he spoke as intent only on understanding both the man and his actions.

Reasons sufficiently obvious explain why the period of English history which Macaulay once hoped to reach, and of which the later and most stirring years were, at first, too near to lend themselves to a judicial historic survey—the Hanoverian period, as it has to be called—long attracted but few writers of independent mind or higher literary qualities. According to the form of most of his books, William (generally known as archdeacon) Coxe belongs to the class of writers of historical memoirs, for the composition of which he had abandoned that of a comprehensive work on the historical and political state of Europe. He obtained a large amount of unpublished material, and put this together with understanding and skill, on a sufficiently broad basis to make his books useful as general guides to the political history of their times. His well-established whig principles are specially manifest in his *Memoirs of Sir Robert Walpole* (1798), which, perhaps, is the least likely of his

works to be altogether superseded. The later *Memoirs of the Duke of Marlborough* (1818—19) have, probably, been not less largely read; but the task, from the biographical point of view, was a more complicated one, and Coxe's treatment cannot be regarded as adequate, although no later life of Marlborough has proved altogether successful<sup>1</sup>. His *House of Austria* (1807), nowadays, needs only to be taken up to be laid down again as altogether defective.

Philip Henry, fifth earl Stanhope, during his membership of the house of commons as viscount Mahon, rendered good service to the literary profession in general by his introduction of the bill which became the Copyright act of 1842, and to historical studies and interests by his initiation of the National Portrait gallery (1856) and of the Historical MSS commission (1869), on which he was one of the first commissioners. His own contributions to historical literature were of a solid and enduring nature; he laid no claim to a place among great writers; but students of the national history, from the war of the Spanish succession to the great Napoleonic war, owe him a real debt. His industry was great; his judgment excellent if not infallible; and his candour unimpeachable. His narrative, if it does not enchain, commends itself by moderation and dignity of tone. He enjoyed rare opportunities, of which his readers had the full benefit, of access to unpublished sources; and although, as his *Miscellanies* attest, full of curiosity as to points of detail, he never lost himself in minutiae, or let slip the main threads of his narrative. His earliest work was *The History of the War of the Succession in Spain, 1702—14* (1832), founded mainly on the papers of his ancestor, the high-minded statesman who played an important part in the war—a well-written book of much interest, which created a considerable impression, with the aid of an essay by Macaulay, between whom and lord Mahon a long-continued friendship ensued. It was followed by *The History of England from the Peace of Utrecht to the Peace of Versailles, 1713 to 1783*, which remained the standard history of England for this period, though, more or less, it left aside certain aspects of the national life and progress afterwards treated by Lecky, and cannot be said to furnish a definite narrative of momentous episodes such as the American war of independence. In 1870, earl Stanhope added a beginning or introduction to his *History*, entitled

<sup>1</sup> The late viscount Wolseley's *Life, to the Accession of Anne* (1894) has a mainly military interest. For Coxe's other works, see bibliography.

*The reign of Queen Anne up to the Peace of Utrecht.* Though it served its turn, it could not but seem a meagre performance to readers whose favourites, both in historical composition and in fiction, had, with brilliant success, illustrated this particular era of English political, literary and social history. Before this, in 1861—2, Stanhope had produced a much superior work, in which the unpublished material at his command had once more stood him in excellent stead, the *Life of the Younger Pitt*, a biography to which he addressed himself with thorough sympathy and which will not easily be altogether superseded. Stanhope's lesser contributions to English historical literature are numerous and valuable, and the whole harvest of his life reflects high credit on his name. His principal work is, in a measure, supplemented by William Nathaniel Massey's *History of England during the reign of George III*, which reaches to 1802. It is the work of a moderate liberal, who had no sympathy to spare for the political ideas of king George III.

Two English historical writers who, though in very different ways, came into close contact with important political ideas of the nineteenth century, and, more especially, with those concerning the progressive development of the British empire, were, at not very distant dates, conspicuous personages in the life of the universities of Oxford and Cambridge respectively. Each in his way a master of style, Goldwin Smith and Sir John Robert Seeley differed fundamentally from one another in the political conceptions which pervaded their historical writing. In 1858, Goldwin Smith was made a member of the commission on national education. When, in 1859, the earl of Derby appointed him regius professor of modern history at Oxford, he had gained much experience as an academical reformer and political journalist, but had his reputation as a historian still to make outside his university. Two years later, he published a volume entitled *Lectures on Modern History*. The most historical of these, *On the Foundation of the American Colonies*, had, at the same time, a distinct political bearing, and, in 1862—3, was followed by a series of letters contributed to *The Daily News*, and afterwards reprinted with additions, under the title *The Empire*, which, in his most forcible style, advocated the separation of the British colonies from the mother-country and their establishment as independent states. This became the governing idea of his political activity, which, at the same time, shaped his later personal life. In 1862, he produced another volume, not less striking in manner and style, entitled *Irish History and Irish Character*. Five

years later, he published an admirable series of historical essays, originally produced as public lectures, and called *Three English Statesmen* (Pym, Cromwell and Pitt). Before this, the great American civil war, during the progress of which he visited the states, had found in him an enthusiastic supporter of the cause of the north. Having, in 1866, been compelled by a severe personal trouble to resign his Oxford chair, he, two years afterwards, transferred himself, with his political aspirations and disappointments, at first to Cornell university, in the United States, and thence, in June 1871, to Toronto. There, for nearly a generation longer, he continued to carry on an incessant journalistic activity. The books he sent forth were not of much importance; and, notwithstanding the fascination of his style, always clear and dignified, the letters from him printed in *The Manchester Guardian* and elsewhere gradually became like the voice of one crying in the wilderness. He can only be classed among historical writers by a courtesy which will hardly be refused to him. He could not keep the spirit of political controversy out of anything he wrote; and, in truth, that spirit was part of his genius.

The career of Sir John Robert Seeley, who, though less intimately connected with public life, and less gifted for taking a personal part in it than Goldwin Smith, exercised a far more enduring influence upon imperial politics than he, was of the least eventful. At Cambridge, he won high distinction as a classical scholar; but his great ability in argument was only known to a few; and when, being then professor of Latin in London, he was discovered to be the author of *Ecce Homo*, published in 1865, the admiration excited by the book, amidst an outburst of controversy, was largely due to its literary qualities<sup>1</sup>. Paradoxically enough, it led to his appointment, in 1869, as regius professor of modern history at Cambridge. His inaugural lecture was published, together with some other lectures and essays delivered by him in the north, in a collection of *Lectures and Essays* (1870).

Seeley's standpoint as a historical teacher and writer was clear to himself from the first. In the opening sentence of the most successful of his works, *The Expansion of England*, he cites 'a favourite maxim of mine,' that history, 'while it should be scientific in its methods, should pursue a practical object.' This object was practical politics. As a new type of sophist, he set himself the task of training, by his lectures and conversation,

<sup>1</sup> See, *ante*, vol. XII, chap. XIII, p. 297. His edition of the first decade of Livy, with its excellent introduction, is mentioned, *ibid.* p. 493.

the statesmen of the future ; the time was not far distant when his applied history would serve to impress upon the nation political lessons of which it seemed to him to stand in need. But he was aware that, while engaged upon this task, he must prove his fitness for it by the production of a historical work of solid merit ; and this he was enabled to do by the publication of his *Life and Times of Stein, or Germany and Prussia in the Napoleonic Age* (1878). The work, which was the fruit of great labour, though hardly of what could justly be called original research, might have filled, at least for a time, a gap in the historical literature of the age in question ; for it appeared midway between the monument of the great statesman piled up by Pertz and the later elucidations of his career, and of its bearings upon German and European history, by Max Lehmann and others. The success to which Seeley's volumes attained was little more than a success of esteem : although he had attentively studied his subject, he was hardly quite at home in the whole of it ; and, though clearly, and, in parts, effectively, written, the work failed to establish itself as one of those great political biographies which may be supplemented or corrected, but are quite unlikely to be ever superseded.

In 1883, Seeley put forth the series of Cambridge lectures on the foreign policy of Great Britain to which he gave the title *The Expansion of England in the Eighteenth Century*. Few political historians have more felicitously carried out the avowed purpose of combining a lucid and connected narrative of a period of the past with a statement of conclusions bearing directly upon political problems of the present. Imperialism, the very opposite system to that cherished by Goldwin Smith and those who thought with him, was here demonstrated to be the ideal which it behoved the British nation to accept and apply as the moving factor in the determination of the future of British dominion. And this dogma was proclaimed at a time when, in British and colonial political life, a parting of the ways still seemed possible ; so that no half-historical, half-political essay was ever more opportunely timed, or more effectively directed to its purpose.

Seeley's last work, *The Growth of British Policy*, was not published till after his death, which took place in 1895. This book is described by its editor, G. W. Prothero, as an attempt to put English history into a new framework, showing how foreign policy affected every stage of its progress. It was intended to be, in substance, an introduction to the history of British policy in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries ; but the author had to trace



the current of his narrative back to Elizabeth, who, as he puts it, was married to her people, whereas James I and Charles I were only married to Anne of Denmark and Henrietta Maria. Seeley avowed it to be his object as a teacher, not to interest his hearers or readers in particular men or deeds, but to show them what results the national action of former times had brought about for ourselves and our children after us, and thus to interest them more and more 'to the close.' 'It is impossible,' he candidly added, 'that the history of any state can be interesting, unless it exhibits some sort of development<sup>1</sup>.'

The history of the British empire in the nineteenth century has, of necessity, employed many pens; but its documentary materials were only in part accessible, and the difficulty of dissociating historical narrative from political purpose or 'tendency' was only to be avoided with difficulty. Harriet Martineau, whose manifold contributions to political and social literature, as well as to journalism and fiction, have found notice elsewhere in this work<sup>2</sup>, in 1848 entered upon the onerous task, begun and abandoned by Charles Knight, of *A History of England during the Thirty Years' Peace*, and, notwithstanding a serious interruption, accomplished it before the end of the following year. 'Always,' as was well said of her, 'a little before her time,' she related the history of an age whose striving after reform was its most marked characteristic in a spirit of moral and intellectual sympathy with its ideas, accompanied by a clear critical estimate of the sum of its achievements; home politics were her chief, but by no means absorbing, concern, and she treated men as well as measures with her habitual candour.

We come nearer to the present age in *The History of England from 1830*, first published in 1871—3, by William Nassau Molesworth, vicar of Rochdale and a reformer who dwelt and worked very near the fountain-head. His unpretentious, but lucid, book, justly exercised a wide popular influence. Finally, mention should be made of Sir Spencer Walpole, who, in his *History of England from 1815* (1878—86) and its continuation, *The History of Twenty-Five Years, 1856 to 1880* (1904—8)<sup>3</sup>, showed himself alive to the great value of a clear grouping of events and transactions according to the sides of the national life on which they bear, and of the

<sup>1</sup> *The Expansion of England*, p. 119 (edn 1883).

<sup>2</sup> Cf., *ante*, vol. XIII, chap. XI.

<sup>3</sup> The last two volumes of this were published posthumously, under the supervision of Walpole's friend, Sir Alfred Comyn Lyall.

demonstration thus afforded of the changes in national policy brought about by the progress in the conditions and ideas of successive generations. He repeatedly contrasts this method with the biographical ; but he did good work in both kinds of historical composition. His intelligence and clearness of mind, and his freedom from political partisanship, together with his unusually varied administrative experience, fitted him for his chief historical task, which he carried through successfully, though without conspicuous power or brilliancy. His observations on financial problems are marked by special lucidity.

Though purporting not to be more than the narrative of an episode in the political and military history of the period, Alexander William Kinglake's *Invasion of the Crimea* (1863—87) justified the labour of many years devoted to the work by one of the most brilliant, but by no means one of the most prolific, prose-writers of the earlier Victorian period. His *Eöthen* (1844) is still read as a singularly delightful record of personal impressions derived from near-Eastern travel. His *magnum opus*, based on the papers of lord Raglan, placed by his widow in Kinglake's hands, was at once an apologia and an accurate and exhaustive narrative of its subject, elaborated with endless care and with the aid of personal observation (he was present at the battle of the Alma), and HomERICALLY ample in its presentment. The opening volumes, with their examination of the causes of the war and their splendid indictment of the author of the *coup d'état*, formed a magnificent portico to the edifice ; but the scale of the whole is excessive, and, more especially since the plan of the book left it incomplete as a history of the war, it has failed to secure a place among great historical works.

Among nineteenth-century historians of Scotland, the precedence, at all events by right of seniority, must be accorded to Patrick Fraser Tytler, who was a joint founder of the Bannatyne club with Scott, and had been a college friend of Archibald Alison. Tytler had historian's blood in his veins<sup>1</sup>, and many years of his life were devoted to the composition of his *History of Scotland* (1828—43), an undertaking first suggested to him by Scott. The *History* plunges in *medias res* with the accession of

<sup>1</sup> His father, Alexander Fraser Tytler (who afterwards took the judicial title lord Woodhouselee) was at one time professor of history at Edinburgh, and wrote several historical works ; his grandfather, William Tytler, wrote an apologetic enquiry into the charges against Mary, queen of Scots, which held the field till the publication, in 1869, of John Hosack's much-read *Mary Queen of Scots and her Accusers*, followed, in 1898 (posthumously), by a summary of her case.

Alexander III, Wallace and Bruce following close, with Bannockburn, and with a thanksgiving that Scotland was spared the doom of Ireland. But a learned enquiry into the state of ancient Scotland displays much antiquarian research, and offers a more graphic treatment of the theme than was, at the time, to be found in any other writer. The narrative ends, almost as abruptly as it began, with James VI's farewell to Scotland on his, in a literal sense, ill-omened departure for his larger kingdom. The *History*, which is written in a grave and simple style, deals with matters both of church and state in a vein of genuine Scottish patriotism, and can hardly be said to be altogether obsolete. Tytler, who was the author of further historical works, rendered great service to historical study in both England and Scotland by taking a leading part in the suggestion of the calendaring of state papers, instead of the publication in full of mere selections of documents.

John Hill Burton's *History of Scotland*, from 1688 to 1745, of which the first portion appeared in 1853, was enlarged by successive additions of earlier periods, and, after Tytler's death, was, in 1870, finally published as extending from Agricola to the last Jacobite rising. Burton, after showing great activity as a periodical writer, editor and journalist, had, in 1846, published *The Life and Correspondence of David Hume*, of whose economical writings he had made a special study, and had followed this successful effort with some lesser productions in Scottish biography. He afterwards reprinted some of his contributions to journalism in the two most popular of his books, *The Book Hunter* (1860) and the very interesting *Scot Abroad* (1862). His *History of Scotland* justified his appointment as Scottish historiographer-royal; but, although the fruit of long and unwearying research, it is ill-arranged and loose in composition, and only held the field because of the absence of a competitor in command of the same abundance of material. As editor of two volumes of *The Scottish Registers*, he rendered an enduring service to the study of Scottish history, which was continued by David Masson. Burton's *History of the Reign of Queen Anne* (1880), though containing curious matter, is as little satisfactory a piece of work as ever came from a historian's hands; but it was the last larger effort of a long and laborious life<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> In Burton's successor as Scottish historiographer-royal, William Forbes Skene, author of *Celtic Scotland* (1876—80), the antiquary was blended with the historian. For his chief works see, *ante*, vol. xii, chap. xv, p. 518.

The last Scottish historian whose name calls for mention here is Andrew Lang, whose recent death (1912) put an end to an almost unexampled continuous flow of varied literary work<sup>1</sup>. It is, perhaps, as a historian, in a broad sense of the term, that he will be best remembered. His gift of narrative stood him in good stead even with so wide a canvas as that of his *History of Scotland from the Roman Occupation* (1890—7), which he lived to complete, though it was hardly carried out with the requisite sustained power. On the other hand, he excelled in the historical monograph, where his great and, perhaps, most notable critical gift had full play; and, if there was an element of 'mystery' in the subject of his story, he felt most thoroughly at home in it. Like Scott, whom, as himself a child of the Border, he loved with his whole heart, he was irresistibly drawn to the lost causes of history—above all, to the Stewart cause; but his critical acumen rarely deserted him in any field, and, while he was deeply versed in mythology, his footing was sure on the doubtful ground between history and legend, and his own favourite among his innumerable productions was his *Life and Death of Jeanne D'Arc* (1908).

Among Irish historians, Lecky holds an undisputed pre-eminence, but of him we shall speak immediately in a wider connection. Like him, John Patrick Prendergast took up the defence of his countrymen against the aspersions of Froude; but, though he bore a name associated with the sufferings entailed by the Irish policy of Cromwell, and had himself the reputation of being a nationalist, he was not under the influence of the sentiments of seventeenth century 'toryism.' His works on Irish affairs, of which *The History of the Cromwellian Settlement* (1863) is the best known, form a very important contribution to the political history of Ireland, and led to his appointment as one of the commissioners for selecting official papers from the Carte MSS in the Bodleian. In 1887, he published *Ireland from the Restoration to the Revolution*. Sir John Thomas Gilbert was of English descent, but born in Dublin and brought up as a strict catholic. In addition to papers on the antiquities of his native city and country, his researches, which made a generally acknowledged mark on the progress of the studies to which he was devoted, include *The History of the Viceroy's of Ireland* (1865) and *The History of the Irish Confederation and the War in Ireland, 1641—9* (1882—91), with a great body of work on the documents of Irish history from ancient times to the early years of the nineteenth

<sup>1</sup> Cf., ante, vol. XIII, chap. VI.

century. Caesar Litton Falkiner, who had made the Irish land acts a subject of special study, and, in 1898, was appointed an assistant land commissioner, collected and discussed, in studies and essays published before his early death, much original material of Irish history in the eighteenth, and, afterwards, in the seventeenth, century. His seventeenth-century work on the Historical MSS commission was both voluminous and valuable.

Turning to the historians of British India and the colonies, we are met on the threshold by the name of James Mill, whose place in the history of English thought has been discussed elsewhere<sup>1</sup>. By his *History of India* (1817), he was the first to accomplish, on a scale and with a breadth of treatment befitting the theme, a history of India under British rule. For the critical side of his task, he was signally endowed by nature, prepared by philosophical study and trained by continuous practice as a writer, more especially in *The Edinburgh Review* (1808—18). On the other hand, he had never been in India; and, as he freely confessed, 'if he had any, had a very slight and elementary acquaintance with any of the languages of the East.' He ingeniously deprecated the force of these objections by arguments from analogy; but their fallacy was sufficiently exposed by the learned Sanskrit scholar Horace Hayman Wilson, who edited the fourth edition of Mill's *History* (1840—8), and continued it from 1803 to 1835. He, also, charges Mill with having, in what is the most originally conceived section of the work—book II, *Of the Hindus*, where it is proposed to summarise, in some 350 pages, their laws and institutions, religion, literature and art—displayed the kind of contempt which is not always based on familiarity; though, in the opinion of Mill's biographer Bain, if these strictures upon the natives really tended to increase the difficulties of British rule in India, this effect was more than outweighed by that of Mill's unsparing criticism of all who had a share in founding and extending our Indian empire. The more strictly historical portion of the work is distinguished by a lucidity of method which, in dealing with masses of matter distributed over a vast area and, in part, reaching back across

<sup>1</sup> See, *ante*, chap. I. Earlier English historians of India had treated the subject from particular points of view. Orme's military history belongs to the eighteenth century (*cf.*, *ante*, vol. x, pp. 293—4); John Bruce, a political historian of note, who had formerly furnished Pitt's government with reports on measures taken for the defence of the country from the days of the Spanish Armada downwards, and had then been appointed keeper of the State paper office and historiographer to the East India company, published the history of that company (1816).

a great interval of time, is invaluable to the student. Mill, as a historian, had no example to follow in the school of thinkers to which he belonged—least of all in Bentham, whose knowledge of history is not to be reckoned among his strong points. On the other hand, Bentham severely blamed the style of Mill's book, and he does not stand alone in his censures<sup>1</sup>. Of later writings, a penetrating insight into the course of Indian history, as a whole, distinguishes those of Sir Alfred Comyn Lyall<sup>2</sup>, whose imaginative, as well as philosophical, mind could not rest content with viewing such a subject as India, with which a long and distinguished official career had familiarised him, under its political, or under any one exclusive, aspect only. His *Rise and Expansion of the British Dominion in India* (1893) grew, as it passed through many editions, into an important work of research; he also wrote a short life of Warren Hastings, and a full biography of Lord Dufferin. His *Asiatic Studies* deals chiefly with Hindu religion in its successive phases.

Colonial history attracted fewer students in the mother-country during the earlier, than during the later, part of the century<sup>3</sup>. Among more recent writers, it seems right to make special mention of John Andrew Doyle and of Edward John Payne, both of whom were born in 1844. The former gained the Arnold prize at Oxford for an essay on the English colonies in America before the declaration of independence, and the chief production of his literary life treated the same theme. The latter devoted the historical labours of his later years to English and other European colonies and to America in general. His comprehensive undertaking *A History of the New World called America* (1902—9) was, however, but partially carried out. Sir Arthur Helps gave to colonial history so much of his busy leisure as was

<sup>1</sup> Mill, also, contributed to the *Supplement to The Encyclopaedia Britannica* (1816—23) a number of important essays belonging to the domain of politics and political philosophy rather than to that of history. They are analysed in chap. v of Bain's biography of Mill (1882). Among his numerous critical writings may be noted an early article (in *The Annual Review* for 1808) on Charles James Fox's fragment on the early part of the reign of James II, published in the same year. Mill compares its high moral tone, to the disparagement of modern historians, with that of the ancient masters, Thucydides, Tacitus and Livy, and deprecates the modern mode of philosophical history as containing, besides its philosophical element, little beyond 'a dry statement of vulgar historical facts.'

<sup>2</sup> See, also, *ante*, vol. xiii, p. 202.

<sup>3</sup> Sir Charles Dilke's *Greater Britain* (1866—7), while possessing both historical and political significance, made its appearance as a book of travel, and is noticed as such in chap. vii, *post*.

left for historical research. His *Spanish Conquest of the New World* did not, however, attain to an enduring success, though the separate biographies in which he reproduced portions of the work could not fail to be popular.

We have reserved, as the first of two particular groups, some of the ecclesiastical historians of the united kingdom not already noted in an earlier volume<sup>1</sup>. Mandell Creighton, though his career connected him closely with several of the historians mentioned in earlier pages of the present chapter, cannot himself be appropriately classed as mainly a medievalist, although his chief historical work is, in part, concerned with the close of the middle ages in the very centre of their ruling ideas and influences. Modern Oxford has produced no more accomplished historian than Creighton, who united with a power of work of which it was not in his way to make show an insight into the force of ideas and the play of character which, in writing as well as in speech, enabled him easily to compass what he prized more than aught else—the establishment of his influence over others. On the other hand, although the cynicism at one time affected by him was superficial only, and was cast aside in face of the most serious purposes of his life, he was without the moral enthusiasm which, in different ways, reveals itself in writers so unlike one another as Freeman and Gardiner. In his *History of the Papacy*, this lack shows itself, not so much in the allowances made for the corruption and other vices of the times in which the lot of some of the pontiffs was thrown, and through which neither a Borgia nor a Medici could be expected to walk unspotted, as in the indifference exhibited towards the chosen spirits of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries on whom depended the preparation and the prosecution of the great work of religious reform. Creighton was, perhaps, less extensively read in the history of early sixteenth-century Germany than in the Italian portions of his subject; but what is missing in his fifth volume is not perception or even fairness of judgment (such as marks the contrast between the ideals of Raffaele and those of Luther); it is, rather, a fellow-feeling with the consciousness of the mighty issues of the struggle which gave its extraordinary force to the movement set on foot by Luther. Nothing, on the other hand, could better illustrate at once the irony and the pathos of history than the characters, as here drawn, of the reformation popes—Leo X, who could not see why

<sup>1</sup> *Ante*, vol. XII, chap. XIV.

his improvements were insufficient, and Adrian VI, who could understand the necessity of real reforms from within, but was unable to give effect to his insight.

Creighton's *History of the Papacy during the period of the Reformation* (1882—94), which should, at the least, have been carried on to the council of Trent, ended with the sack of Rome. But the book is neither a fragment nor a torso, and, at all events in its earlier volumes, sufficiently illustrates the qualities which the historian brought to bear upon the composition of it, and which made it something more than a supplement to Ranke's greater work. The book could not satisfy the demands of lord Acton, who would have preferred an indictment of the papacy for its historic shortcomings; but it helps to explain, without seeking to palliate, and forms a memorable contribution to the history of learning. His style was well suited to his method of treatment, being wholly free from pedantry and artificiality, and sensitive to any of those lapses into exaggeration which were one of the chief faults noted by him in his favourites, the Italian humanists of the pontificate of Nicholas V.

Before Creighton addressed himself to his chief historical work, he had found many outlets for his critical powers, and had successfully practised the art of epitomising on subjects so different as a history of Rome and a life of Simon de Montfort. After he had exchanged his Northumbrian parish for the chair of ecclesiastical history at Cambridge, he engaged anew in varied historical work, wrote a life of cardinal Wolsey, a history of his native town, Carlisle, and, later, a biography of queen Elizabeth, which attracted much favour. He was, also, associated, from 1886 to 1891, with *The English Historical Review*—a critical journal the foundation of which had, at various times, occupied the minds of J. R. Green and other younger historians, and of which Creighton was judiciously chosen as the first editor. It marked a very distinct advance in the method, as well as in the spirit, of English historical study, and maintained itself, without serious difficulty, on the level on which, with the co-operation of lord Acton and others, it had been placed at the start. But, in 1885, Creighton's appointment to a canonry at Worcester had marked the beginning of the high ecclesiastical career that awaited him, and for the sake of which his historical labours had, ultimately, to be relinquished. The last volume of his *Papacy* was brought out while he held the see of Peterborough. But his work there and in London (whither he was transferred in 1896) must, like the episcopal



life of Stubbs, be left out of sight in this place<sup>1</sup>. His continued interest in historical studies is shown by the fact that, in 1896, the year of his appointment to London, he wrote the introduction to *The Cambridge Modern History*, in place of his friend Lord Acton.

A younger author in the same field of historical research, but more especially in earlier periods, which he was acknowledged to have mastered with wholly exceptional completeness, was William Edward Collins, during the last seven years of his life bishop of Gibraltar. A writer on English church history of a different type was John Henry Overton, who died as canon of Peterborough and had long been a Lincolnshire rector. His and Charles J. Abbey's history of *The English Church in the Eighteenth Century* (1878) is a useful book, which has helped to remove prejudices; while his *William Law, Non-juror and Mystic* (1881) is, perhaps, the most attractive among his many large-hearted and well-written contributions to our later religious history. William Richard Stephens, who died as dean of Winchester, was author of various contributions to church history and joint editor, with William Hunt, of *The History of the English Church*, to which he contributed the second volume (from the Norman conquest to the accession of Edward I); and he wrote the lives of his father-in-law, dean Hook, and of Freeman. Thomas Graves Law, who, in his later years, was librarian of the Signet library at Edinburgh, by some of his writings threw light on interesting passages in the history of English catholicism in the later Elizabethan period, more especially on the conflicts between Jesuits and seculars (1889) and on the archpriest controversy. He was a man of high ability, and distinguished by broad-mindedness as well as by learning<sup>2</sup>.

In Scottish ecclesiastical history proper, the palm must be assigned to an earlier writer, Thomas McCrie, an 'original seceder' from the established church. Through his *Life of John Knox* (1812), as the subtitle of the book indicates, he sought to throw light upon the history of the Scottish reformation. It was followed by *The Life of Andrew Melville*, and the two books, which were supplemented by material belonging to a later period, became standard narratives of the greatest historical movement in Scottish national life. McCrie further contributed to the history of the reformation two less exhaustive works, on its

<sup>1</sup> It is told in the second volume of Mrs Creighton's *Life and Letters of her husband* (1904).

<sup>2</sup> He was, also, eminent as a biographer, and edited *The New Testament in Scots*.

progress and suppression in Italy and in Spain. Whether, had he carried out his design of a life of Calvin, it would have proved equal to his life of the great Scottish reformer, it is, of course, impossible to say; but few ecclesiastical historians were better qualified for essaying even so thorny a theme.

The history of civilisation cannot rightly be described as a product of the nineteenth century; yet, on the one hand, the immense advance made in the course of that century in the methods, as well as in the range, of scientific studies, and, on the other, the unprecedented interest which, from about 1830 or 1840 onwards, began to be taken by historians, as well as by politicians, in the life and social conditions of the people at large, gave a wholly new impulse to the cultivation of this field of enquiry. Its originator was, of course, Voltaire; and, though, throughout the nineteenth century, this branch (if it can be called a branch) of history was vigorously carried on by writers of various kinds in Germany. France never lost her hold upon it. So early as 1830, Guizot's *Histoire de la Civilisation en France*, as an organic part of a more comprehensive scheme, sought to execute the design which Voltaire had proposed to himself in his *Essai sur les Mœurs*. At a later date, the philosophy of history was incorporated by Comte in his system of positivism, and, more especially, in social science (or sociology), as intended to teach the evolution of social life, and to define the laws which govern its conditions and mutations. The philosophy of history, thus recast, ignored any but natural laws, although, not unfrequently, its disciples differed as to what justified the elevation of a particular experience to the authoritative position of a general law. Comte was neither a historian nor the intellectual progenitor of historians; but one English writer, at least, was led by his influence to attempt what amounted to a new departure in our historical literature, since Robertson and Hallam, while following Voltaire and Guizot respectively, had not gone far in developing their principles.

Of Henry Thomas Buckle it may be averred that his *History of Civilization in England* (of which the first volume appeared in 1857, and the second in 1861) 'hit the taste of the time,' as few works of the kind have done—one of these, perhaps, being Chillingworth's *Religion of Protestants*, of which Buckle says that 'the immense success of this great work must have aided that movement of which it is itself an evidence.' Buckle's volumes were little more than an introduction to his subject, the first dealing, in a way which can hardly be called rambling, but is

certainly deficient in perspicuity of plan, with the preliminaries of the theme, which it ends by sketching in outline, while the second treats, specifically, of two applications of the method of enquiry adopted. The historical subjects chosen are the history of the Spanish intellect from the fifth to the middle of the nineteenth, and that of Scotland and the Scottish mind to the end of the eighteenth, century. Both sections of the volume are so vigorous, not to say racy, in treatment that the success of this portion of Buckle's work is not wonderful, even if, to some, it may seem to indicate, as the book did to Milman, that its author was himself 'a bit of a bigot.' In his earlier volume, he had proclaimed his views of history and historians with the utmost clearness. The most celebrated historian was esteemed by him 'manifestly inferior to the most successful cultivators of physical science'; for the study of man is still in its infancy, as compared with that of the movements of nature. No believer in a science of history need, therefore, disturb himself as to the problem between freewill and predestination which, at one time, overshadowed the world of thought; history, to him, is 'that of a world from which men and women are left out'; and what has to be considered is the influence of physical laws as governing conditions of climate, food and soil.

Buckle's criticism of existing historical methods was, in some respects, an expansion of the ideas of Comte. Perhaps, in spite of his great abilities and accomplishments, and his unwearying devotion, during the greater part of his manhood, to the task he had set himself, he lacked the historical, and, more especially, the ethnographical, knowledge requisite for writing a history of civilisation comprehending east as well as west, or even for applying to the earlier ages of English civilisation standards other than those of his own age and school of thought. He was, as Leslie Stephen says, a thorough-going adherent of John Stuart Mill and the empirical school, and adopted its attitude towards history. The stimulating and, in many ways, corrective effect of his one important book is not to be gainsaid, nor the share which he had in placing the treatment of historical problems on a broader and more scientific basis.

William Edward Hartpole Lecky composed the earliest of the works by which he rapidly built up a great reputation, under the unmistakable influence of Buckle, of whom he was, then, an ardent admirer. He was repelled by Comte, but acknowledged that Comte had 'done more than any previous writer to show that the speculative opinions of any age are phenomena resulting

from the totality of the actual influences of that age<sup>1</sup>. The actual firstfruits of Lecky's Dublin training—if we may pass over a still earlier anonymous broad-minded essay entitled *The Religious Tendencies of the Age*—were the impassioned, likewise anonymous, *Leaders of Public Opinion in Ireland* (1861). Though this production bore testimony both to his patriotism and to his eloquence, it fell quite flat; but it was reprinted after he had become famous and, again, in an enlarged form, in 1903. Its initial bad luck disheartened the writer, and left him at a loss whither to turn. Early in the following year, before beginning a long succession of travels (centring in visits to libraries) in Spain and other continental countries, he began the work which was to spread his reputation almost as quickly as Buckle's had been spread by his *History*; or, rather, he wrote a treatise, *The Declining Sense of the Miraculous*, which, after being printed separately, formed the first two chapters of his *History of the Rise and Influence of the Spirit of Rationalism in Europe* (1865). By means of an argument of transparent clearness, conveyed in a style congenial to the theme, but revealing, here and there, the author's power of giving expression to strong feeling, it demonstrates that European progress is due to the spirit of rationalism, the opposite of that of theological dogmatism, just as the tolerance demanded by reason is adverse to the persecution engendered by bigotry. The argument is developed at great length and with a superabundance of illustration; but neither the writer's youth nor the nature of his mind inclined him to brevity, and the interest of most readers in such a subject can only be sustained by a copious use of concrete exemplification. Lecky's second work (which always remained his own favourite), *The History of European Morals from Augustus to Charlemagne* (1869), dealt with the same field of philosophical enquiry as its predecessor; but it differed from the general survey of European 'illumination' in undertaking to examine, as it were *ab extra*, the origin and growth of moral ideas which dominated a period of European life, and to show the development undergone by these ideas in the course of their contact with the actual condition of men and things. The later book, necessarily, contains a larger amount of purely philosophical discussion than the earlier, and it brought upon the author attacks from the utilitarian school.

Lecky, who, at the time of the publication of his second

<sup>1</sup> See the estimate of Comte's position in literature in *Memoir of W. E. H. Lecky*, by his wife, p. 54, note.

important work, had barely passed his thirtieth year, now turned to political, in lieu of philosophical, history. He was always averse from fragmentary composition, and the nursing of a great design seems to have been almost a necessity to his years of maturity, at all events so long as he remained out of parliament. He felt that he had a good opportunity 'of airing his Irish politics in a parallel or, rather, a contrast, between the Scotch and Irish business'; and the appearance of Froude's *English in Ireland* lent a special force to the full treatment of Irish history which, at the risk of disproportionateness, he intended to offer in his forthcoming work. But *A History of England in the Eighteenth Century* (1878—90) was designed on the broadest of bases, and on lines well according with the most comprehensive demands of political philosophy: being intended, as the preface states, 'to disengage from the great mass of facts those which relate to the permanent forces of the nation, or which indicate some of the most enduring features of the national life.' Foremost stood the history of political ideas and of their embodiment in political institutions; but economical and social history received a measure of attention far exceeding that usually bestowed upon it in previous histories of the eighteenth century; while religious history (the rise of methodism, for instance, and the progress of religious tolerance) were allowed full consideration. On the other hand, much that possessed 'a biographical, party or military interest' was, for lack of space, suppressed, although Lecky was always interested in individual character or genius, and never wearied in pursuing the successive phases of the history of a mind like Burke's, with whom, indeed, he had, undeniably, some intellectual affinity. The Irish chapters, alike in the second and in the sixth to eighth volumes, are, on the whole, the most successful in the work, as most completely covering their subject. Historical writing such as this can afford to dispense with minor attractions, and to make no pretence of creating interest either by accumulation of details or by devices of style.

The last volumes of Lecky's *History*, published in 1890, contained an account of the rebellion and the union, perhaps the most striking and the most stirring portion of the entire narrative. When he had finished his great work, he had, although not yet much more than fifty years of age, become 'a little tired of history'; a happy marriage, and consequent new sphere of life, together with a sense of unbroken success, may have helped to make him unwilling to resume the historian's pen, although he was

assiduous in the revision of the works he had already produced. His *Democracy and Liberty* (1896) took him back into the sphere of political philosophy; its tone is studiously moderate, although the applications of the principles enunciated to actual politics are undisguised. *The Map of Life* (1899) is more distinctly aphoristic and was, perhaps in consequence, more widely popular. His latest publication was, as has been seen, a revised edition of his earliest contribution to history—a study and a science of which he may fairly be said, about the turn of the century, to have been the foremost British representative.

## B. BIOGRAPHERS AND MEMOIR-WRITERS

Biography, like portrait-painting, has always flourished in England—whether because of the love of the concrete which marks our race, or because of the individualism of character as well as of intellect to which our insularity and our freedom have been alike propitious. But, although the number of English biographies is legion, and many of them have not floated away into oblivion with the outward facts of the lives recorded in them, few have secured for themselves a permanent place in our literature. To some of these, already mentioned under the names of their authors or of the great writers of whom they treated, we do not propose to return in the present chapter; passing by even such a masterpiece of English biography as the *Life of Sir Walter Scott* by his son-in-law, John Gibson Lockhart<sup>1</sup>. The subject of this delightful biography is, indeed, itself incomparable; for which of our great English men of letters is Scott's equal in blended humanity and serenity—except Shakespeare, of whose life we know next to nothing?

Scott's own historical works, apart from the *Tales of a Grandfather* from Scottish and French history, comprise the Scottish history which he wrote for Lardner's *Cabinet Cyclopaedia* immediately after he had completed the last of his imaginative works, *Anne of Geierstein*, and the rather earlier *Life of Buonaparte*. The latter, written 'in the midst of pain, sorrow and ruin,' is an extraordinary effort—a twelvemonth's labour extending over what, 'on the original model of his works,' would have filled from thirteen to fourteen volumes; but its details met with sharp criticism, and it can hardly be said to warrant Lockhart's prediction that 'posterity will recognise Napoleon's Livy in Scott.'<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Cf., *ante*, vol. xii, chap. i, and bibliography.

<sup>2</sup> Lockhart himself published a *History of Napoleon Buonaparte* (1829) and a *History*

His influence upon historical literature, which continued and immeasurably developed that of Châteaubriand, was of far greater importance than were his own contributions to it. Perhaps the most direct and signal expression which it found was in French literature; Thierry's *Norman Conquest*, as has been well observed, could hardly have been written, or at least written as it was, without *Ivanhoe*<sup>1</sup>. But, at home, too, the doctrine of local colouring had impressed itself, once for all, upon historical narrative.

Byron's autobiographical memoirs have perished, perhaps not unhappily for his fame, inasmuch as he 'was never written down by anyone but himself'<sup>2</sup>; Moore's life of his friend (1830), appended to Byron's *Letters and Journals*, however, with all its shortcomings, whether from the critical or from the purely historical point of view, will never be laid aside. Moore had previously tried his hand at biography in a superficial but pleasant *Life of Sheridan* (1825); at a later date, he wrote a *Life of Lord Edward Fitzgerald*, of whom he had no personal knowledge as he had of Sheridan and Byron. He also left behind him an autobiography, which was edited, together with his journals and correspondence, by the willing hand of his friend lord John Russell.

Southey's *History of the Peninsular War*, already noted among his other historical and biographical writings<sup>3</sup> was, to all intents and purposes, superseded by Sir William Napier's work on the same subject (1828—40). Napier, in the words of his biographer<sup>4</sup>, had himself 'nobly shared in making a history which he afterwards so eloquently wrote.' Yet his book, while containing passages of magnificent élan, by reason of its lengthy and general method of treatment survives chiefly as a military history, in which character it has few competitors in our literature<sup>5</sup>.

of the late War, with Sketches of Nelson, Wellington and Napoleon (1832). As to his editorship of *The Quarterly Review*, see, ante, vol. xii, chap. viii. For some of his imaginative works, see bibliography.

<sup>1</sup> Barante, too, in his *Histoire des Ducs de Bourgogne*, presents himself as under the same influence. Cf. the entire sec. iii of bk. v of Fueter, E., *Geschichte der neueren Historiographie* (1911).

<sup>2</sup> Cf., ante, vol. xii, p. 103.

<sup>3</sup> Cf., ante, vol. xi, p. 167.

The first lord Aberdare.

<sup>5</sup> Of the famous *Wellington Despatches*, edited by colonel Gurwood (13 vols. 1834—9), which attracted the ingenuous admiration of their author himself, those which have reference to the Peninsular war are contained in vols. iv to xi (1835—8). Sir William Napier's *Life and Opinions of Sir Charles Napier* (1857), though written 'in the spirit of a knight errant...to vindicate the fame of his brother Charles, as *The Peninsular War* had been written to vindicate that of his chief, Sir John Moore,' is rendered quite unsafe by partisanship, reproducing, as it does, the assertions of his *Conquest of Scinde*, and *Administration of Scinde*, books whose noble qualities are marred by violence of attack as well as by eagerness of defence. No more fiery spirit

The biographical form of composition was adopted by William Roscoe in his chief historical works, which included an English version of one of the best, because one of the sincerest, autobiographies of all times, *The Memoirs of Benvenuto Cellini, a Florentine Artist: written by himself*. Roscoe was drawn to the study of the Italian renaissance by a congeniality of taste and feeling which he had cultivated, on his own account, from his youth up, and to which he had remained true through all the vicissitudes of an active career of business and politics. He thus became a mainspring of the intellectual movement which led many English lovers of letters and art in his and the following generation to turn once more to Italy as the chief fountain of their inspiration. From his youth onwards, he had cherished the idea of making Lorenzo de' Medici the subject of his first work; nor would it have been possible to find any second figure of the Italian renaissance so typical of both its political and its literary side. The book which, at his own cost, he printed (1796) in sumptuous fashion was itself short, but furnished forth with appendixes of excerpts, sparkling in Latin, and with a series of notes seductive to a learned eye. The unqualified success of Roscoe's *Lorenzo* was not, altogether, repeated in his *Life of Leo X*; which covered ground, in part, too dangerous to be trodden without censure. But, though the Italian translation of the later work was placed on the Index, while the original proved by no means palatable to the adherents of the German reformation, it is a delightful book and breathes the atmosphere of that Rome from which Benvenuto preferred to withdraw on the death of the Medicean pope. In his later years, Roscoe published an interesting volume of further illustrations of his *Life of Lorenzo*, in defence of his hero, besides producing an edition of Pope. He had in him the making of a historian of civilisation, as well as of a merchant-prince; but life is an unkind task-master, and it is to his honour that, by the efforts of his own literary genius, he succeeded in doing much for the humanities which he loved<sup>1</sup>.

A later, and, to some moderns, less attractive, phase of the renaissance movement was brought nearer to English readers by the one larger work published, amidst a number of smaller contributions to the literature of scholarship and adjoining fields of research, by ever burnt in the heart of a historical writer; yet he was never more himself than when inditing an unfrequent apology.—John Campbell's *Lives of the Admirals* (1742—4) went through several editions, and an abridgment appeared so late as 1870.

<sup>1</sup> As to J. A. Symonds' contributions to the history of the Italian renaissance, see, *ante*, vol. XIII, chap. XIII.



Mark Pattison, the renowned rector of Lincoln College, Oxford. Yet, his *Isaac Casaubon* (1875), though an admirable piece of work, fitly described by Pattison's pupil and friend Richard Copley Christie as 'the best biography in our language of a scholar, in the sense in which Pattison<sup>1</sup>, in common with Casaubon and Scaliger, understood the word,' was not produced till the author found himself anticipated (by Jacob Bernays) in the life of Scaliger, for which, during thirty years, he had been preparing. Although much of what Pattison wrote besides *Isaac Casaubon* (including the collected *Essays* and a characteristic life of Milton in the 'English Men of Letters' series) is worthy of preservation, it was in his own posthumously published *Memoirs* (reaching to 1860) that he made an addition of surpassing interest to biographical literature. His express prohibition of the cancelling of a word of these *Memoirs*, except a few paragraphs at the beginning which seemed to be of too egotistical a character, was conscientiously obeyed; and the result is a book of self-confession—but of the sort that obliges the writer to confess his opinion of others as well as of himself. He tells us how it was only at an advanced period of his life that he had come to understand Goethe's ideal of self-culture, and the pollution and disfigurement of it by literary ambition. Luckily, 'the vulgar fallacy that a literary life meant a life devoted to the making of books' so far prevailed with Pattison that his pen was rarely idle, and that he made himself memorable, not only in the educational history of his university, but, also, in the history of learning and letters.

Whatever may be the place of Sir James Stephen among the historical writers of the earlier Victorian period, he is sure of remembrance among English biographical essayists. His 'works,' no doubt (as Charles Lamb might have said), repose, for the most part, at the Colonial office, which he ruled for many years as under-secretary. But the fruits of his scanty leisure, gathered in 1849 under the title *Essays in Ecclesiastical Biography*, together with *Lectures on the History of France*, the solitary published memorial of his efforts as William Smyth's<sup>2</sup> successor in the

<sup>1</sup> See his notice of Pattison in vol. XLIV, *D. of N. B.* R. C. Christie was himself a scholar of the type to which he refers, and produced, besides other scholarly work, his excellent monograph, *Étienne Dolet, the Martyr of the Renaissance* (1861). Cf., *ante*, vol. XII, p. 333.

<sup>2</sup> The lectures of William Smyth, who resided at Peterhouse for more than forty years—the last of four modern history professors belonging to that college, of whom two preceded Gray—form, together with those of Sir James Stephen, a link between the earlier and the later days of history teaching in the English universities. At Cambridge, the call for serious historical study had hardly begun to be raised in

modern history chair at Cambridge, display high literary qualities, with characteristic features of their own. To his legal training, Stephen owed his introduction to administrative work, and he was the maker of many constitutions, before, in his *Lectures on the History of France* (which extended over the whole period from the separation of Gaul from the Roman empire to Louis XIV), he expounded at length the inner political history of that country. The 'sociological' view of history was an abomination to him. His early connection, strengthened by marriage, with the evangelical school of religious thought, and, more especially, with that 'Clapham sect,' to which one of the best known of his essays offers a lasting tribute, lent force to his religious convictions and warmth to his moral sympathies. He could not see more than one side to the conflict between the rise of Christianity and the decay of the Roman empire, and he perceived the retributive hand of Providence in the troubles of the church of Rome following on the persecution of the Albigenses. But, as time went on, his wide reading, combined with the teachings of experience, broadened his sympathies, more especially as he did not transfer his official dogmatism into his best literary work. 'The historian,' he says, 'aims at one kind of praise, the lecturer in history at another.' In many of his essays, as well as in those of his lectures which dealt with 'the Power of the Pen in France,' he succeeded in blending with a vivid characterisation of real men something of the imaginative power that projects itself into great lives of the past.

There was, perhaps, more difference than resemblance in the gifts which the two sons of Sir James Stephen respectively inherited from their father, or which were peculiar to themselves; but, though Sir Leslie Stephen, in his *Life of Sir James Fitzjames Stephen*, naturally dwelt on family features, the elder brother's interests did not lie in the direction of biographical or other history<sup>1</sup>. Leslie, on the other hand, among his many claims to an enduring literary fame, has none superior to those arising out of

Smyth's, or even in Stephen's, time. Yet, Smyth was not only a highly accomplished man—a poet of some reputation and an excellent talker—but well-read and discerning, a moderate whig, able to admire Burke without condemning Mackintosh. Thus, his *Lectures on the French Revolution* (1840), considering the incompleteness of authentic materials, may be described as one of the earliest adequate and dispassionate English treatments of their subject.

<sup>1</sup> His chief eminence was that of a jurist; as a *Saturday* reviewer, he dealt, mainly, with subjects appertaining to moral, political, or social philosophy. His *Story of Nuncomar and the Impeachment of Sir Elijah Impey* (1885) was an exceptional product of his Indian life.

his work as a biographer, and as the first architect of the greatest monument of national biography possessed by our literature<sup>1</sup>.

Among collective works narrating in succession the lives of occupants of particular offices, the precedence belongs to the biographies of royal personages. Considerable popularity was attained by *Lives of the Queens of England* (1840—8), by Agnes and Elizabeth Strickland, published, by the wish of the latter and elder sister, under the name of Agnes only. She followed it up by *Lives of the Queens of Scotland and English Princesses connected with the Royal Succession of Great Britain* and *Lives of the Bachelor Kings of England*, from William Rufus to Edward VI, to which series her sister Elizabeth was, again, a contributor. Other series ensued, including both Tudor and Stewart princesses, and the seven bishops. She was not a powerful writer, but indefatigable in the accumulation of illustrative detail and conscientious in the use of it. After the completion of Miss Strickland's chief work, Mrs Mary Anne Everett Green, who, previously, under her maiden name Wood, had published *Letters of Royal Ladies of Great Britain*, brought out *Lives of the Princesses of England* (1849—55), on which she had been long engaged. The very large amount of valuable work done by her as one of the editors of the *Calendars of State Papers* at the Record office left her little leisure for literary activity of her own; but she produced, among other books, *Letters of Queen Henrietta Maria* (1857), a volume based entirely on original research, and collected much material for a series of lives of our Hanoverian queens, to which was to have been prefixed a life of the electress Sophia. It is to be regretted that this plan remained unexecuted, for Mrs Everett Green had sound historical judgment as well as extensive and accurate knowledge of our national history, from the Elizabethan age downwards.

A biographer of royalty, also, was Sir Theodore Martin, whose *Life of the Prince Consort* (1875—80), undertaken by queen Victoria's desire, is founded largely on original papers, in part of great value for diplomatic history. Martin, who, while an active lawyer, was one of the most accomplished as well as one of the most versatile men of letters of his times—essayist, poetic translator and parodist—also wrote, besides an early memoir of his comrade in satire, William Edmonstoune Aytoun, a *Life of Lord Lyndhurst* (1883)

<sup>1</sup> The story of *The Dictionary of National Biography* is told in *Memoir of George Smith*, by Sir Sidney Lee, prefixed to vol. I of the first supplement of the *Dictionary* (1901). As to Sir Leslie Stephen, see, *post*, chap. III.

and a memoir of his own adored wife, the great and beautiful actress best known by her maiden name Helen Faucit (1900).

The *Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury* (1860—76) by Walter Farquhar Hook, dean of Chichester, and previously vicar of Leeds, form a characteristic memorial of the evening 'leisure' of a long life devoted to the service of the church whose entire history is surveyed in this long series of volumes<sup>1</sup>. An even greater success than that obtained by this series, though partly of the mixed kind which does not make for edification, attended the publication of lord Campbell's *Lives of the Lord Chancellors* (1846—7) and *Lives of the Lord Chief Justices of England* (1849—57). The *Lives of Lord Lyndhurst and Lord Brougham*, which followed (1860), filled the cup of remonstrance to overflowing. (The life of Lyndhurst had, as was just seen, to be, more or less adequately, written over again by another hand); as for Brougham, he had found time to add to his innumerable literary offspring his own *Life and Times*, which was published posthumously (1871.) Far more attractive, though their humour is by no means devoid of occasional causticity, are the pen-and-ink portraits of the Scottish bench and bar in the first quarter of the century published in *Memorials of His Time* (1856), by lord Cockburn, biographer of lord Jeffrey (1852).

The most important English biography produced in the mid-Victorian age was David Masson's *Life of Milton, narrated in connection with the Political, Ecclesiastical, and Literary History of his Time* (1859—80). The full title of the book must be given in order to indicate its range; since, when the author had, at last, brought the work to a conclusion, he was warranted in expressing his satisfaction in having 'been able to persevere to the very end in the original plan, omitting nothing, slurring nothing, that the plan required.' In a word, this classical book is a history of as momentous a period of twoscore years as is to be found in the national life of England—grouped, on the principle enunciated by Carlyle, round the personal life and labours of one of its greatest men and one of the greatest of English writers. Everything Milton wrote is here taken into account: of every important poem or prose-work from his hand a complete history and a critical analysis are supplied; and he is consistently viewed in connection with his times, with the movements which shaped their course, and with the men from whom those movements sprang, in state and in church, in peace and in war, in learning and in literature. Whether it be in the fascinating

<sup>1</sup> Cf., *ante*, vol. xii, p. 274.

picture of Milton in his youth, pure as the Castalian fount from which his soul drank inspiration, and rich with ten talents and the resolve to multiply by cultivating them—or in the complete review of the prose-works which Pattison and others deplored, but which Masson preferred to explain—or in the survey of the last seven years, and of Milton's surroundings in life and literature, and his solitude in the presence of *Paradise Lost*—this biography nowhere loses sight of its subject or contracts it within narrower limits than are necessary in relating the life of a great man who, while his name belongs to all times, was himself part of his own. Though the magnitude of the scheme necessitates frequent surveys or retrospects, which sometimes look like digressions, but are not really such, the general arrangement is clear; here and there, perhaps, the scaffolding is still visible. Masson's style, rather conspicuously, lacked ease and grace, without possessing that irresistible note of individuality—the individuality of genius—which belonged to the style of his friend Carlyle. But, in candour and sincerity, at all events, the biographer of Milton was equal to the editor of Cromwell's letters, and he surpassed the greater writer in assiduity of research and in the simplicity of his attitude towards the facts of history<sup>1</sup>.

Of the great masters of continental literatures, Dante missed an English biographer of the highest qualities in Richard William Church, though the essays on him by this delightful writer and admirable critic are among the most notable of his literary productions, which include short lives of St Anselm and of Spenser<sup>2</sup>. Goethe, to whom, from Henry Crabb Robinson, the author of the *Diary*, onwards, a growing body of English readers had, largely under the influence of Carlyle, come to look up with veneration, found in George Henry Lewes the most widely popular of all his biographers. Lewes had made a name for himself by his *Biographical History of Philosophy* (1845—6), as well as by less ambitious work; in his *Life of Goethe* (1855) he produced a work of great literary skill; yet it unmistakably lacks the deeper note, which he may have been well-judged in not attempting to force.

John Forster, by his *Life and Times of Oliver Goldsmith* (1854),

<sup>1</sup> For Masson's other biographical works, see bibliography. A biographical historian of considerable merit, who also produced a useful edition of Dryden, was William Dougal Christie, whose *Life of the First Earl of Shaftesbury* (1871) deserves commendation as a book of value as well as of capacity, though the 'rehabilitation' of Achitophel may not be regarded as complete.

<sup>2</sup> As to dean Church, cf., *ante*, vol. xii, pp. 271—2. The distinguished Italian scholar, Arthur John Butler, published, in 1885, a short *Dante, his Times and his Work*.

his *Life of Walter Savage Landor* (1869) and his *Life of Charles Dickens* (1872—4), together with some admirable biographical essays and the first volume of a *Life of Swift*, took a place in the first rank of English biographers, and was, for a long time, the friend and oracle of many eminent English men of letters of his day. In his earlier years, he had cherished a more concentrated kind of ambition. So far back as 1830, he had thought of writing the life of Cromwell; and, although this was not to become the chief work of his maturity, it was included in his valuable series entitled *Lives of the Statesmen of the Commonwealth* (1836—9). The life of Sir John Eliot was afterwards (1864) expanded by him into a larger biography, and he had previously (1860) published a brace of monographs (one of them enlarged from an earlier essay) based on a careful examination of parliamentary material and dealing with two critical episodes of the struggle between Charles I and the Long parliament. Forster had entered deeply into the spirit of the great struggle of the Stewart age, as is shown by the essay *On English Freedom under Plantagenets and Tudors* prefixed to the second of these works. Altogether, whatever may have been his, in the circumstances very excusable, foibles, his literary life was one of generous purpose, and of rare energy.

Among the numerous memoir-writers proper of the century, there can be no doubt that, notwithstanding the habit of self-depreciation, at times truly pathetic, to which his fastidious and complicated nature was secretly prone, Charles Cavendish Fulke Greville bears away the palm. The three series of *The Greville Memoirs* (1874—87), which comment on the course of English politics and society from the accession of George IV to the year 1860, in some measure differ from one another; in the earlier volumes, the writer adheres to the principle of leaving time to soften, and even to arrest, his judgments; in the second, and, no doubt, in the third, series occasional suppression was, in consequence of the relative nearness of events, found necessary by the editor, Henry Reeve; while, on the other hand, the years brought with them a gentler tone, together with an occasional weariness of the great world. For the rest, Charles Greville was always ready to play the part of mediator as well as that of confidant; and his essential qualities as a memoir-writer remained to him throughout. He was gifted with an insight into character hardly surpassed by any of the great predecessors whom he could never quite keep out of view. His style, though, as it were, instinctively polished, was free from all desire for epigrammatic

effect; he never says either too much or too little. Neither personal goodwill nor personal dislike hindered him from perceiving the failings of Wellington or ignoring the merits of Peel; and the vagaries of Brougham diverted him too much to allow of his even here lapsing into caricature. The set characters which, on the occasion of their deaths, he drew of the former two, and of personages so diverse as Melbourne, Althorp and Harrowby, Talleyrand and Macaulay, lord George Bentinck and Charles Butler, lady Harrowby and Mme de Lieven, Luttrell, Alvanley and D'Orsay, are all, more or less, masterly, and this list is by no means exhaustive. When he occasionally tried his hand at a political pamphlet or letter, neither his force nor his self-restraint deserted him, and his anonymous book *The Policy of England to Ireland* (1845), in which he advocated a policy of concurrent religious endowments in Ireland, was a rare instance of political foresight as well as of historical judgment.

*The Croker Papers*, not published till 1884, when nearly a generation had passed after John Wilson Croker's death (1857), and more than half a century since his retirement from active public life (1832) throw a great deal of light upon the bitter party conflicts of the twenty-two years during which he held the secretaryship to the admiralty. In this office, his first important task was to defend the Walcheren expedition; but attack rather than defence was his *métier*. He was of the inner councils of his party on most of the great political questions of these years, and among the unconvinced opponents both of parliamentary reform and the repeal of the corn-laws. But his chief services to the conservatives (he was the inventor of this name, scouted by Disraeli, who had no love to spare for him) were rendered in the pages of *The Quarterly Review*. *The Croker Papers*, which are held together by a very thin biographical thread, derive their chief interest from the letters comprised in them from the duke of Wellington, lord George Bentinck and others, and from Croker's occasional journal addressed to his patron, the marquis of Hertford.

*The Creevey Papers*, published in 1903, about seventy years after the death of the writer or recipient of the letters of which, together with fragments of diaries, they mainly consist, have no pretension to rank in historical significance by the side of *The Croker Papers*, or in literary value by that of *The Greville Memoirs*. Thomas Creevey, though born in Liverpool, seems to have regarded Ireland as his native country, but was an absentee

till he had turned sixty. His position in the political and social world was really due to himself, and to a combination of fidelity and adaptability which made him, at one time, a member of the extreme radical faction, and, at another, commended him to the goodwill of the sovereign whom he had previously mentioned as 'perfidious Billy.' He had a caustic style, not untouched with the grossness fashionable in the days of the regency, and his use of nicknames is appalling in its irreverence. His notices of Brougham ('Wickedshifts') are even more vivid than Greville's; but he rarely rises to a higher tone, though his account of lord Grey (to whom he loyally adhered) in his latter days does honour to both. Creevey, at one time, contemplated writing a history of his times, and, in 1826, published, as a pamphlet, a series of letters on reform addressed to lord John Russell (whom he could not abide).

A novel form of political memoir—though it had, of course, been previously used for other ends—was that of *Conversations with M. Thiers, M. Guizot and other distinguished persons during the Second Empire*, recorded by the wellknown economist Nassau William Senior and posthumously published in two series, covering together the years 1852 to 1863. Senior's interlocutors were largely, but not altogether, political opponents of the empire, and they include many literary celebrities; so that the *Conversations* faithfully mirror the thoughts of the intellectual flower of contemporary France. These volumes had been preceded by *Journals kept in France and Italy*, and by *Correspondence and Conversations of A. de Tocqueville*, who pronounced Senior's the most enlightened of English minds. The rather earlier *Journals, Conversations and Essays relating to Ireland* (1868) comprise, with reprinted earlier papers on a subject always full of interest to the author, journals of visits to Ireland in 1852, 1858 and 1862, and conversations with people of all sorts whom he met on his travels, up to his former tutor and lifelong friend archbishop Whately.

This rapid and unavoidably incomplete review of the progress of English historical literature in the nineteenth century could not be more fitly concluded than by a reference to the eminent teacher and scholar, the very type of modern historical learning in its maturest development, with whose literary ideas and designs the present work may claim a kind of collateral kinship. To speak of lord Acton as a teacher might seem to attach an undue significance to the exertions of six years out of a full life, great as



those exertions were, and marked by a touching desire to be, within academic limits, 'all things to all men.' But it is not to his professorial work that the tribute suggested should be limited. His inaugural lecture (though he had not devoted several years to the preparation of it, as Gray did to that of a discourse he never delivered), besides being, in elevation of tone, as noble an utterance as has, perhaps, ever been made on a similar occasion, indicates, partly with playful irony, partly with high moral dignity, the purposes and qualities needing to be combined in the study of history at the stage of progress now reached. Acton's own historical learning has often been represented as barren; and it is true that, notwithstanding his extraordinary diligence in the daily increase of his store, its accumulation resulted in the production of no great historical work. The plan of a history of liberty which he had formed early in life was never carried out by him, and there remain only the hints given in two popular lectures delivered by him at Bridgnorth, so early as 1877, to show his conception of the theme.

By liberty he meant the assurance that every man should be protected in doing what he believed to be his duty against the influence of authority and majorities, custom and opinion<sup>1</sup>.

The problem of his personal life was how to reconcile this principle with submission to the authority of the church of which, throughout life, he was a devout member. The influence of Döllinger had long dominated his mind, and it reflects itself even in his literary manner. But, as a writer, he held the principle of liberty, as above defined, sacred in great things and in small, and in the affairs of both church and state. The edict of Nantes, he told his Cambridge class, 'forms an epoch in the progress of toleration, that is, in the history of liberty, which is the marrow of all modern history<sup>2</sup>.' The struggle against absolute monarchy in England 'is the point where the history of nations turned into its modern bed. It is the point also where the Englishman became the leader of the world<sup>3</sup>.'

Undoubtedly, the task of Acton's life, as he had set it to himself, fell short of accomplishment because of the actual endlessness of the method, which, for a long time only half consciously, he had pursued in making ready for it. *Ἔστιν θάλασσα*—but to no mortal is it given to exhaust that sea, though his knowledge may cover, besides a wide range of theology, the whole field of history, and

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Gooch, G. P., *English History and Historians* (1913), p. 384.

<sup>2</sup> *Lectures on Modern History* (1906), p. 171.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 205.

include an intimate acquaintance with the by-paths and hidden lanes that lead to it, and though he may possess, and turn over with daily and nightly hand, four libraries owned by him at the same time in four distinct counties or countries<sup>1</sup>. Yet it would be a mistake to suppose that Acton found difficulty in making good literary use of the knowledge he was thus incessantly acquiring, and that, while one of the fullest of historical writers and critics, he had not, at the same time, a ready pen, or one possessed of a humour which only a feeling of reverence prevented from running rapidly into sarcasm. Many a distinguished author has taught himself the calm dignity of manner which came naturally to Acton, both in writing and in personal intercourse; his foible was rather to let his text wear the aspect of notes (at times the more enjoyable the more carefully they are studied), or, at least, of apophthegms following one another so closely as to produce the effect of overloading.

Acton's literary career began (a little before his parliamentary) in 1859, with his nominal editorship of *The Rambler*, in succession to Newman, the main editorial work being still carried on by Richard Simpson, the biographer of Edmund Campion. Acton's contributions to this journal, which began with an article 'Mill On Liberty,' were by no means confined to the discussion of topics connected with the growth of liberal catholicism; and the same was the case with his numerous articles and reviews (under the heading 'contemporary literature') in *The Home and Foreign Review*, which, in 1862, took the place of the departed *Rambler*<sup>2</sup>. Three years later, *The Chronicle* made its appearance, for which Acton wrote many articles of political and historical interest, ending with a notable paper on the massacre of St Bartholomew, besides carrying on a succession of notes on the political situation in the papal and other Italian states, and a continuous comment in the shape of reviews, on 'contemporary literature.' When, to these, are added his contributions to *The North British* and *The Quarterly Review*, as well as to *The English Historical Review*<sup>3</sup>, together with occasional lectures and addresses, it will be seen that *Letters of Quirinus* and the subsequent *Open Letter to a German Bishop on the Vatican Council* (1870), and his letters to *The Times* on the Vatican

<sup>1</sup> See lord Bryce's account in *Studies in Contemporary Biography* (1903), p. 382.

<sup>2</sup> Acton wrote its final word, 'Conflicts with Rome.'

<sup>3</sup> The first number contained a characteristically comprehensive article by Acton entitled 'German Schools of History,' followed in a later number by 'Döllinger's Historical Work.'

decrees—or, rather, on Gladstone's celebrated letter about them—(1874), form only a part of a prolonged many-sided literary activity. After his removal to Cambridge, his lectures (of which two series have been published since his death) proved the firmness of his grasp not less than the wellknown width of his learning, and reawakened the expectation of further historical work of an enduring character from his hands.

It had been hoped, by Acton himself, and by many who would have taken pride in working under his leadership, that *The Cambridge Modern History* would, besides embodying some of his historical ideas, offer an opportunity to its projector of laying down in its opening chapter his conception of the legacy of the middle ages, and that his editorship and successive contributions would inspire the progress of the work as a whole. Neither hope was destined to be fulfilled. But his elucidation of its plan remains to demonstrate what, to a great scholar, whose opportunities had surpassed those of any previous or contemporary historian, seemed the range of the sphere in which modern history moved and had its being, and in what spirit the materials now open to historical criticism should, in his judgment, be transfused into historical narrative. Across the century, the spirit of the greatest of modern writers on ancient history—Niebuhr—seems in contact with the spirit of him who had most closely scanned the course of modern history; and, together, they seem to vindicate the right and duty of the advance made in historical studies and literature during the century's course in England and elsewhere. 'The historians of former ages,' lord Acton said, in the incomparable inaugural lecture already cited, 'unapproachable for us in knowledge and in talent, cannot be our limit,' because 'we have the power to be more rigidly impersonal, disinterested and just than they.'

### C. POLITICAL ORATORS AND WRITERS OF PAMPHLETS

The great age of English political oratory might seem to have passed away with the fatal year (1806) which removed both Pitt and Fox from the scene of their mighty conflicts; a greater orator than either—Burke—had died nearly a decade earlier. When, in 1802, James Mill arrived in London, he at first thought the eloquence of the house of commons inferior to that of the general assembly (though nearly a generation was to elapse before the chair of that assembly was filled by Chalmers, the most brilliant of all luminaries of the Scottish pulpit). But Mill listened with

admiration to Fox and Sheridan, as well as to some other well-known parliamentary speakers of the time.

One of these was William Wilberforce, then in the midst of his immortal efforts for the abolition of the slave trade, accomplished in 1807. The all but unique position which, after this, he held in public estimation was by no means due only to his self-devotion to a cause appealing to the deepest instincts of humanity, and to his detachment from all party motives of action, in 'any undertaking which had the welfare of mankind for its object'.<sup>1</sup> It, also, owed much to the charm of his personality, the modest dignity of his bearing and the unaffected ease and simple grace of his delivery.

Among other parliamentary figures prominent in the early years of the century was William Windham, whose birth and breeding as a country gentleman of ancient descent had implanted in him, together with an unextinguishable interest in the peasantry, a spirit of unflinching patriotism and of independence which refused to bend before any pressure of court or party. A school-fellow of Fox, and a follower of Burke, he had imbibed a love of literature which induced Johnson to describe him as, in that region, *inter stellas Luna minores*. His oratory, however, found its proper sphere in the house of commons, and it was when he led the Grenville party in opposition that his ability as a debater was most conspicuous. His speeches, of which a considerable collection remains, are full of apt, rather than striking, Latin quotations, besides occasional native sallies. In a different key from his attacks upon the peace of Amiens, and his stern comments on the seizure of the Danish fleet, is his long and temperate speech on the scandal which drove the duke of York from office. No politician was ever more free from self-interest, or orator from rant. 'Nothing,' he said, 'is more agreeable than to praise the Athenians among the Athenians; but I rather consider it the duty of public men to speak wholesome truths.'

Samuel Whitbread had been educated with the same care as Windham and, by his marriage with the sister of his school-fellow, afterwards earl Grey, was brought near to the innermost whig circle, though his wealth was derived from the great trading concern in which he was a partner. Long a devoted follower of Fox, he was fearless in the denunciation of all kinds of abuses; during the last six years of his life, he is said to have been the most frequent speaker in the house of commons, and

<sup>1</sup> See the admirable essay on Wilberforce in Sir James Stephen's *Essays in Ecclesiastical Biography*.

was the soul of the agitation in favour of the princess of Wales. His vehemence of manner was a constant source of derision to satirists with pen or picture, who always remembered the brewery; but, though his impetuosity reflected his enthusiasm for what he held right, he could, as both Sheridan and Burdett found, be prudent on occasion.

Thomas, afterwards lord, Erskine seems never to have quite caught the tone of the house of commons, though a consistent member of the whig party, whose principles he, also, upheld with his pen<sup>1</sup>. But his fame rests on his forensic oratory, which entitled him to choose for the motto of his peerage the words 'trial by jury.' He was engaged in a series of cases bearing on the liberty of the press and the charge of constructive treason; and defended in turn lord George Gordon, Thomas Paine, the publisher Stockdale, who had incurred the wrath of the house of commons, and the radical founder of the London Corresponding society, Thomas Hardy, whom he brought off amidst the wildest popular enthusiasm. That his triumphs, described by earl Russell as those of 'the sword and buckler' which 'protected justice and freedom,' were free from meretricious glitter seems to be borne out by those of his speeches that have been preserved out of an enormous mass of oratory, if allowance be made for the egoism which seems inseparable from the Ciceronian manner and which was certainly not alien to Erskine's nature.

George Tierney, on the other hand, was a parliamentary politician proper, whose course of public action was determined by personal interest as well as by political opinions. Though of Irish descent, he was educated at Eton and Cambridge (Peterhouse); and though, from 1797 onwards, a declared opponent of Pitt (with whom he fought a blank duel in the following year), he was not a favourite of Fox, and, indeed, for a time, carried on the struggle against Pitt on his own account, as nobody's friend, unless it was as the 'friend of humanity.' His later career was equally varied, though he attained to a leading, rather than a commanding, position. His ability as a debater made him a most formidable, as he was a most vigilant and tenacious, adversary and he may be regarded as the last of the great parliamentarians of the revolutionary period. His speeches seem to have been often colloquial in manner, but never deficient in point, and to have excelled in the art of restating an adversary's case so as to 'turn it inside out.

Unlike lord Castlereagh, the extraordinary faultiness of whose

<sup>1</sup> See his *Defence of the Whigs* in vol. xv of *The Pamphleteer* (1820).

style, in both speech and writing, seems to reflect shortcomings which have been allowed to weigh too heavily against such merits as should be conceded to his foreign policy, George Canning, whose star shone forth in full splendour as that of Castlereagh sank below the horizon, had long been famed for the force of his political oratory as well as for the irresistible wit of his political writing. He gained a place among the foremost orators of the day by his great speech in December 1798 against the resumption of negotiations with France; among the tributes paid to the mighty spirit of Pitt after his death in 1806, Canning's soared into the loftiest sphere of eulogy. In 1808, he vindicated the seizure of the Danish fleet—for which, as foreign secretary, he was primarily responsible—in a speech of extraordinary power. But his great popularity began with his addresses to the constituency of Liverpool; and it was, in the first instance, the fire of his oratory which prepared the triumph of his statesmanship. After he had begun to rise to the height of his parliamentary position, and had delivered the great speech (28 April 1825) upholding the principle of pacific non-intervention in the case of Spain, he returned to the subject in a memorable address at Plymouth, which strikes a note of far-sighted grandeur such as no other political orator has reached in England since the days of Burke. When the recognition of the Spanish American colonies was an accomplished fact, Canning, in the famous defence of his policy, 12 December 1826, spoke of himself as having 'called in the new world to redress the balance of the old.' When he became prime minister of Great Britain, without even then commanding the firm support of either king or parliament, his strength still lay in the popularity which, in a free community—be it Athens or England—always sustains the statesman who has mounted to the foremost place among its leaders; and this Periclean supremacy was the direct offspring of his oratory as well as of his statesmanship. The duke of Wellington—at least a candid critic—pronounced Canning the finest speaker he had ever heard; and this admiration extended to his state papers. Although, in his published speeches, it is not often, except in the greatest of them<sup>1</sup>, that we can catch a notion of his completeness in matter united

<sup>1</sup> A characteristic example of Canning at his best will be found in the long speech 'On unlawful Societies in Ireland' in vol. v of the 6 vol. edition of his *Speeches* (1828). The grand personal note (in regard to himself as part cause of the Peninsular war) is not wanting here, nor are humorous quotations, ranging from Dr Johnson to Mrs Malaprop.

to perfection in manner—of the ‘rich, gay, aspiring eloquence’ ascribed to him by lord Morley—there is a family likeness in them all. Imaginative power and wit, often inimitably apt, are sustained by a scholarship which abhors an unpolished corner in the structure; and, through all, there is visible a large-mindedness beyond the common range of public oratory, and a large-heartedness inviting that kind of popularity which Canning was not ashamed to allow he loved. Of vagueness or of violence, there is nothing in his speeches; and, when defending himself against misrepresentation, he could grandly say: ‘If you have not heard me in vain, it is well; if you have, I have troubled you too long, but it has been for the last time.’

The other great orator of Canning’s later years, and beyond, was Henry lord Brougham, whose oratorical powers, exercised, in one way or another, during a period of some years, are, together with his other gifts, to be described only by the word prodigious. His resources were infinite, and the aptness of his use of them unrivalled; but his *forte*—we should rather say his *fortissimo*—must have lain in conversation, in which his exuberance of life and spirit were altogether incomparable. His speeches, on the other hand, as Greville, whose pages sparkle with *Broughamiana*, happily puts it, were too long by reason of the perpetual bubbling-up of new ideas. And there was (can it be denied?) something else which interfered with his full success as an orator, as, of course in a profounder sense, it did with the completeness of his political career. He was, in public life, trusted by neither friend nor foe; and, with all his brilliancy and all his force, he conveyed an undefinable impression that he had no strong opinions on any subject that he took up for attack or defence. Yet, when all deductions have been made, the power and the versatility of his oratory, due, in no small measure, to the care which he bestowed upon his efforts, remain one of the wonders in the history of genius. The scornful fire of his invective burnt itself into the hearts and souls of its victims, and he was not less himself in long and elaborate discourses, on subjects outside the ordinary range of political controversy. His eloquence associated itself with his labours as a law reformer, with his services to education and the advance of science and with a vast miscellaneous literary productivity; but its fame outstripped that of all his other achievements, and will make him remembered when much that he did and all that he wrote will have fallen into oblivion.

One of the few speakers, whether on legal or on other themes,

whom Brougham was unable to crush was John Singleton Copley, lord Lyndhurst, who, according to Greville, was master of the one thing, which, in the end, the house of lords preferred to everything else, and which Brougham could never compass—conciseness. Lyndhurst, whose career and views present certain points of resemblance to those of his friend Disraeli, made his way to eminence by an unusual union of qualifications, which included an oratory of rare polish and point. It showed itself to particular advantage in those annual reviews which adorned the close, and pointed the failure, of many a parliamentary session, and which, though Melbourne called them Lyndhurst's *exercitationes*, were certainly not academical in the sense of innocuousness. On the judicial bench, he had excelled in summing up; and a famous judgment of his<sup>1</sup>, though afterwards reversed on an appeal which he resisted in a second address of extraordinary ability, is described, by one who was no kindly chronicler (lord Campbell), as 'by all accounts the most wonderful ever heard in Westminster Hall.'

Among later luminaries of the bar and bench who played a prominent part in English political life, it is impossible to pass by Sir Richard Bethell, afterwards lord Westbury, who combined with extraordinary acumen and lucidity of statement a gift of sarcastic *innuendo* which voice and manner rendered absolutely intolerable. Sir Roundell Palmer, afterwards first earl of Selborne, a refined scholar and devout churchman, who, as an equity pleader, was inferior neither to Westbury nor to Hugh McCalmont, afterwards first earl, Cairns, became one of the greatest judicature reformers of the age. Like Selborne, Cairns, though of an austere nature, was a most effective speaker in parliament (as in his defence of Ellenborough) and might have led his party had he chosen. Sir Alexander, afterwards lord, Cockburn, in the greatest crisis of lord Palmerston's career, proved his most valuable ally, and rendered other political services at the close of a brilliant legal career.

In the great reform movement, with whose triumph a new era in English political life began, the foremost figure is that of Charles second earl Grey, to whose courage and sincerity the chief credit of the passing of the bill is, above all, due. Since, in 1786, he had (though matters of finance were never much to his taste) in an admired maiden speech attacked Pitt's commercial treaties, he never faltered, either in the days of the eclipse of the whig party, or in those of catholic emancipation (in which he delivered a speech

<sup>1</sup> In the case of *Small v. Attwood*.



which Stanley (Derby) said he would rather have made than four of Brougham's) and of reform. It was thought regrettable that lord Grey allowed the fiery nature of John George Lambton, first earl of Durham, to domineer over him; but this was, chiefly, a matter of temper. Durham's own career was brief and stormy<sup>1</sup>; the celebrated report on Canadian affairs by which he is most generally remembered is said to have been mainly written by his secretary Charles Buller, a young liberal of great personal popularity, a lively orator and an acute reasoner in both speech and pamphlet.

In the debates on the Reform bill, Macaulay's renown as an orator was first established; although, perhaps, he never quite fulfilled the exorbitant expectations formed of him at the time of his first entrance into the parliamentary arena. It was but natural that what was most admirable in his speeches should be their literary qualities; they were usually of the nature of harangues or set orations, carrying away in their rush the arguments of his adversaries. But they were not designed as replies and, thus, lack some of the most stimulating qualities of parliamentary oratory. Among his later speeches, those on the question of copyright, to which he could contribute a most extraordinary wealth of illustration, are notable as having not only influenced but actually determined legislation.

Outside parliament, the Reform bill campaign was carried on in innumerable speeches, among which those of Henry ('Orator') Hunt should, perhaps, not be passed by. When, after the great bill had passed, he entered parliament, he soon sank into a non-entity, and was said by Cobbett to be 'really as inoffensive as Pistol or Bardolph.' Hunt and Cobbett died in the same year (1835); but no comparison is possible between their powers.

To oratorical distinction, neither John Charles, viscount Althorp (afterwards earl Spencer), lord Grey's lieutenant in the house of commons, where he enjoyed a unique personal regard, nor his successor in the leadership of the whig party and as prime-minister, William Lamb, viscount Melbourne, had any wish to attain. The latter, indeed, though he went so far as to declare that 'the worst thing about the Spaniards was their speaking so well,' could himself do this as most other things well when obliged to do them. The two statesmen, in turn colleagues and rivals, who succeeded lord Melbourne as heads of the liberal party, lord John, afterwards

<sup>1</sup> His advanced radicalism is reflected in his speech of 1822, explaining his own reform project, printed in *The Pamphleteer*, no. xli, vol. xli.

earl, Russell and Henry Temple, viscount Palmerston, were, neither of them, born to sway senates by the force or grace of their eloquence. But the extraordinary self-confidence inbred in the former and his early services to the cause of parliamentary reform, helped him over the repeated breakdowns, at times self-provoked, of his career, and occasionally seemed to warm up the outward coldness of a courageous and patriotic nature. Lord Palmerston, whose easy disposition, great capacity for affairs and quick perception of the mainsprings of personal popularity established him in the end as a national favourite, made at least one great speech in his life (the *Civis Romanus* speech of 1850), besides many other successful, and some unsuccessful, efforts; he neither shrank from claptrap, nor always avoided flippancy, but the ring which found an echo in English hearts was not wanting where there was a need for it. In Palmerston's early days, Byron had called his oratory unconvincing; but he had learnt something from Canning, besides the traditions of his foreign policy.

It is not as an Irishman that it is usual to remember Palmerston; but not a few orators of Irish birth were the descendants of an age when the art of oratory had been fostered by the spirit of parliamentary independence, or themselves lived at a time when the Irish bar, as the one high-road to a career of public distinction, encouraged an eloquence directly appealing, in manner as well as in matter, to broad popular sympathies. Among the successors of Grattan, William Conyngham, afterwards lord, Plunket—to whom, in spite of O'Connell and 'the anti-vetoists, the conduct of the catholic relief movement was, in the first instance, entrusted—was probably, the most finished speaker. His career at the Irish bar reaches back some years into the eighteenth century, and he did not resign the Irish lord chancellorship (in which he had exhibited very high judicial qualities) till 1841. One of the finest of his speeches was that of 21 February 1829, on the catholic claims, which, while demonstrating that the exclusion of catholics from the legislature was a constitutional innovation, upheld the Irish church establishment as, historically, part of the constitution. This and other speeches by him which remain are, certainly, on a very high level of both argument and style. The gravity of his eloquence frequently rose to imaginative loftiness; and, in the opinion of a cultivated critic<sup>1</sup>, he would, had he been bred in parliament, have been the greatest speaker that

<sup>1</sup> The first earl of Dudley. See *The Life, Letters and Speeches of Lord Plunket*, by Plunket, D., with an introductory preface by lord Brougham (2 vols. 1867), p. 67.

ever appeared in it. Lord Brougham compares his twofold eminence, at the bar and in parliament, to that of Berryer, perhaps the most exquisite speaker to whom it has been the lot of anyone now living to listen. But, from the point of view of popular effect—effect exercised not upon this or that assembly only, but upon the nation as a whole, the name of every other Irish orator—perhaps that of any orator of whatever people or age—pales before that of Daniel O'Connell. There is little if any exaggeration in this statement, albeit exaggeration was his element. He told Jeremy Bentham that, in his opinion, it was right to speak of one's friends 'in the strongest language consistent with truth'; and, as to his adversaries, from Wellington and Peel downwards—apart from the magnificent scurrilities which he hurled at such offenders as lord Alvanley and Disraeli—the vituperative habit had, as we read, grown upon him in ordinary talk till such words as 'rogue,' 'villain,' 'scoundrel,' had, in the end, lost all precise significance for him. But, as an orator, he had his vocabulary as he had the whole of his armoury of action under control; nor was there ever a demagogue so little led away either by his tongue or by the passion within him. Rude, when it suited him to be rude, and coarse, when coarseness was expected from him, he was irresistible as an orator; first, because he never lost sight of his purpose, and, secondly, because he was never out of sympathy with the whole of his audience—indeed, speaker and audience were one. That he should have remained true both to the aspirations of the Irish people and to his principle of excluding illegal means or violence from the action which he urged, was, perhaps, the greatest triumph of his oratory. It was forensic in both origin and features; but the orator, like the man—his wit, his ardour, his impudence, his piety—were racy of the soil to which he belonged by blood and indissoluble congeniality, and, though he held his own against the foremost debaters of the house of commons, he was at his best, from first to last, in his native surroundings, in law courts or city hall, or facing the multitudes at Limerick or on Tara hill.

The third name in the triad of great Irish orators who strove, though not always in concord, for the welfare of their country was that of Richard Lalor Sheil. Educated under old-fashioned legitimist and Jesuit influences, he had literary gifts, which, in his younger days, made a name for him in poetic drama. But the life's work of this 'iambic rhapsodist,' as O'Connell—not felicitously—called him, was, both at the bar (where his most brilliant, and

surely longest, speech was in defence of the 'liberator's' son, 1844) and in the house of commons, devoted to the cause of Ireland, and to that of catholic emancipation in particular. His parliamentary position was never either an uncompromising or a commanding one, though his fire and fluency alike called forth admiration and made Gladstone, in his youthful days, avow himself unwilling to follow him in debate. Nor is it easy even now to resist the effect of such a speech as that in which (in October 1828) he advocated the catholic claim before a Kentish audience on Pennenden heath and taunted England with being, in the matter of religious tolerance, 'behind almost every nation in Europe.' He shone both in exordium and in peroration; but his taste was less pure than Plunket's, and his invective less torrential than O'Connell's.

We pass abruptly to the other side of politics, though the first name to be mentioned is still that of an Irishman. But the duke of Wellington made no pretence of figuring among the orators of his age. Insensible as he was to popular applause, he sometimes spoke well without knowing it, and, also, at times (as in the great reform debate of 1831), spoke very badly. His oratory, in every sense of the word, was unstudied, and, on constitutional questions, quite out of its element. His despatches would suffice to show that he was not without style; but he reserved it for matter of which he was master<sup>1</sup>.

With the great name of Wellington is inseparably associated that of Sir Robert Peel, whose political life more distinctly, perhaps, than that of any English statesman since Walpole, centred in the house of commons. Outside that assembly, a certain stiffness, born of reserve rather than of haughtiness, may, at times, have stood in his way; and he could be set down as 'a cold feeler and a cautious stepper.' But the house of commons he knew, and came to sway for a long time with an undisputed pre-eminence; and the list is long of his speeches which mark momentous advances in our political history and attest his extraordinary personal ascendancy. His maiden speech, delivered in 1810 at the age of twenty-two, was thought to have been the best since the younger Pitt's; and, nine years afterwards (when the question was under discussion whether Canning or he was fittest for the leadership of the house), Canning described the speech in which Peel

<sup>1</sup> His eldest brother, Richard marquis Wellesley, a brilliant classical scholar and a lover of literature (Italian in especial), was also a highly accomplished orator, though he spoke but little in parliament.

introduced the resolutions providing for the resumption of cash payments, on which 'Peel's act' was founded, as the greatest wonder he had ever witnessed. Ten years later, in March 1829, Peel delivered one of the greatest, and, at the same time, one of the most characteristic, speeches of his entire career—that on catholic emancipation, ending with a noble peroration fitly described as eloquent with the spirit of duty. Yet, the most memorable part of his career as a parliamentary statesman and orator only set in with his definitive return to office in 1841. In the following year, he made his first great budget speech—a complete course of political economy'—and to this period, too, belongs his speech (1843) on the Factory acts and the existing distress, which, to baron Brunnov, seemed 'eloquence as the ancients understood the word.' After his historic resignation, he made one further great speech—on 28 June 1850, the day before that of his fatal accident—against the vote of confidence in Palmerston's foreign policy. Bright commemorated it as Peel's 'last, most beautiful and most solemn' utterance; and it was as worthy of him in its moderation as it was in its truthfulness. Peel's greatest quality—his moral courage, to which he owed the self-confidence that made him, in his own words, 'pique himself on having never failed in carrying anything proposed by him'—is reflected in his oratory. It is neither impassioned nor richly ornamented (though he was a good scholar); but it never falls short of its purpose and can rise with the greatness of the issues which it is directly designed to bring about.

During the long period of waiting which followed after Peel had broken up the party, the conservatives were under the leadership of Stanley, with lord George Bentinck (who died in 1848) and Disraeli as his lieutenants in the house of commons. Edward Stanley—lord Stanley from 1834, and (fourteenth) earl of Derby from 1851—had, after distinguishing himself at Oxford, begun his political life as a whig, and, in the Reform bill debates, opposed Peel, and put down Croker in a most successful speech (1831); but he separated from that party in 1833, and became a supporter of Peel, whose Irish policy he championed with great spirit against O'Connell. He twice filled the office of prime-minister, but was in opposition during most of his later political life. Though far from reckless in the guidance of the counsels of his party, as a speaker, the 'Rupert of debate,' as Bulwer Lytton called him in *The New Timon*, was, beyond doubt, one of the most splendid, as he was one of the most impetuous, foemen in the field. His oratory was,

however, under the control of a well-trained taste<sup>1</sup>, and free from the artifices of rhetoric. While his vivacity caused him, at sixty, to be thought one of the cleverest young men in parliament, he was occasionally accused of a levity of tone recalling other contests than those of the political arena. The earl of Derby's colleague, the earl of Ellenborough, remained one of the foremost orators of the house of lords, even after he had resigned the presidency of the board of control in 1838. He was a man of brilliant gifts; but his oratory reflects the masterfulness of disposition which he had most prominently displayed as governor-general of India.

In the revolt against Peel, of which the house of commons was, necessarily, the chief scene, the leading parts were played by lord George Bentinck and Disraeli. Lord George had made a high-minded sacrifice of his interest in the turf, and, during his short political career, proved a very effective, if not always highly refined, speaker, who took great trouble with facts and figures. The parliamentary career of Benjamin Disraeli, first earl of Beaconsfield, really began with those attacks upon Peel which left their mark upon the political history of the country. They, also, left their mark upon his style of oratory, which, after, at first, deriving its significance from its invective, retained the original seasoning even when it was applied to the unfolding or defence of a positive policy. Disraeli's power of sarcasm (which no orator ever more successfully heightened by scornfulness of manner and by mimicry of gesture) was, however, only one of the gifts conspicuous in a long succession of speeches—some delivered, as it were, at bay, some, in the moment of triumph. None of these gifts was more assiduously cultivated by their possessor than the imaginative faculty, with which he was sumptuously endowed and which, in great matters and in small, though in imperial, in preference to 'parochial,' questions, he constantly turned to the fullest account, but always with consummate discrimination and often, as it was said, 'behind a mask.' Thus, the splendour of his ideals, which, in his younger days, had been largely associated with fantastic conceptions or racial traditions, became, in the end, one of the most valuable of his political ways and means, took captive queen and country, and, for a time, made the world listen to his eloquence as to the messages of an oracle.

Among the politicians to whom the name of Peelites clung even after their leader had passed away, Sir James Graham, who, at first, was regarded as their leader and who, at one time,

<sup>1</sup> As to his translation of the *Iliad*, see, *ante*, vol. xii, p. 834.

seemed likely to rise to a foremost position in the conduct of affairs, was a fine speaker, though rather inclined to pompousness, and the best in the house on financial and economical subjects (William Huskisson, whose knowledge of these had been most valuable to Peel, was without oratorical power). But, with all his ability and statesmanlike insight, he could not gain the full confidence of his contemporaries, perhaps because he seemed to be without perfect trust in himself. The most brilliant (except one) of his political associates, Sidney Herbert, afterwards first lord Herbert of Lea, died before his oratorical and other gifts had secured to him the highest political honours.

Among ministers whose attention was chiefly, though, in neither case, exclusively, given to foreign affairs, the earl of Clarendon and earl Granville were the most conspicuous; they were alike men of great personal charm and accomplished speakers, skilled in the art of diplomatic composition and in the use of forms and turns of courteous speech, an art which has often been missing in English statesmen who lacked their cosmopolitan training. To these qualifications, Granville, whose unselfish services were of the utmost value to his chief, added that of a popular vein, which won him many friends outside the foreign offices of Europe, and made him singularly winning as an orator. During many a long year of party conflict, Gladstone had no more loyal adjutant than the marquis of Hartington, afterwards duke of Devonshire, who possessed in a degree never surpassed the power, invaluable in debate, of bringing home to friends and opponents the absolute sincerity of his utterances.

Inseparably linked together in political history, and most of all by the isolation in which the pair found themselves at more than one stage of their political career, are the great radical names of Cobden and Bright. From the days when the elder of them, Richard Cobden, first entered parliament, in order there to prosecute, with a single-mindedness as complete as that of the platform, the campaign for cheapening the food of the people, an absorbing care for the condition of the people, remained, from first to last, the note of his oratory, and of the remarkable political writings in which he gave occasional expression to his principles. In all his deliverances, he is found transparently sincere, perfectly definite in purpose and as free from *ad captandum* devices as any orator who has commanded the applause of vast popular audiences or has conquered the attention of a vigilantly antipathetic house of commons. His persuasiveness,

which Bright described as irresistible, was based on a groundwork of facts, and their logic convinced his hearers, as his imperturbable sureness of himself showed them to have convinced the speaker. Although a self-taught orator as well as politician, Cobden was not wholly without a literary sense—the notorious reference to the Ilissus was a mere bit of mischief; but, neither fancy nor humour, nor even the deeper movements of indignation, entered much into the spirit of his speeches, which, penetrating to the kernel of the matter, scattered all the mistakes and false doctrines by which it was enveloped. In the Corn law meetings, he left it to his indefatigable coadjutor William Johnson Fox (Browning's far-sighted friend), who was always intent upon the interests of the working classes, to draw touching pictures of the social suffering which the leaguers were seeking to remedy. Even his antagonism to war, to which he gave thoughtful expression long before he inveighed against the concrete example of the conflict with Russia, rested, primarily, on other than humanitarian grounds. He was not an enthusiast in either love or hate, and could believe in the sincerity of others—even of Palmerston—as he was absolutely sincere himself. John Bright—Cobden's comrade in the earliest and most unequivocally successful phase of their public lives, and in their opposition to a national war which reason and conscience made them deem unjust, but virtually without his steadfast associate's support in the long campaign for that extension of the franchise on which modern democracy is based—was, beyond all doubt, one of the greatest orators of his own or any other age of English life. The individuality which mirrored itself in his eloquence, and the ascendancy which it exercised, were those of genius. Although he insisted on yielding to Fox, who spoke less frequently and with more elaboration of art, the palm of orator of the anti-Corn-law league, he displayed, even in this early period of his life, those qualities which gradually developed into majestic grandeur. In many respects, the simplest of men, and an adherent of many of the homely ways of his community, he seemed to tower among those around him by an unquestioned, half-heroic, dignity of personality and presence. The arts of flattery were as strange to his oratory as they were to his daily converse; and irony and sarcasm seemed alien to the pure truthfulness of his nature. He was well-read—though not, perhaps, in the common sense of the phrase. His mind was steeped in the Bible; in his loftier flights, he seemed to be breathing the atmosphere of the Old Testament;



the thoughts and cadences of Milton were ever on his lips; and he was familiar with a few other great writers capable of inspiring noble passages of his eloquence. Solemn reproof, lofty appeal, sympathy with woe and awe of the divine—all these are to be found in his speeches, where they touch the heights and depths of human feeling. Of himself, unlike many great orators, he says little; but the whole history of his public life reveals itself in his speeches on free trade, or peace and reform, on Ireland, on India and on that great transatlantic republic whose cause he upheld, by the side of John Stuart Mill, in the critical hour. His oratory resembled his life in the grandeur of its simplicity—hardly a gesture to heighten the effect of the magical voice, only an occasional sally of wit or humour to relieve the earnestness in which moral force was naturally blended with human-kindness, and the whole a self-consistent and unfaltering advance, and a repose on the heights, when they had been reached, of prophetic faith. Milton, he said, had taught him, when in his youth he was beginning to think about public affairs, that true eloquence is ‘but the serious and hearty love of truth<sup>1</sup>’; and the precept, from first to last, shone like a beacon on his path.

A place of his own among the political orators of his day must be assigned to Robert Lowe, afterwards viscount Sherbrooke, a liberal in the general tendency of his ideas and texture of his intellect, but raised to the height of his political influence and oratorical renown as the protagonist of the struggle against democratic reform, with Edward Horsman as the second spokesman of the Cave (1866—7). In Lowe’s speeches, as in his conversation (his writings were few), his academical training found very distinct expression, though antithetically mixed with a stinging wit and with a knowledge of registration and administration taught by eight years of colonial, followed by a long and varied home, experience of parliamentary and official life. But the intrinsic power of his oratory was such as to enable him to fight with unparalleled effect the battle on which he had chosen to enter against what he called the sentimental, the fatalistic and the aggressive or compulsory democracy, as represented by Mill, Gladstone and Bright; and his brief autobiography remains to illustrate the nature of his wit, under which all sentiment withered away.

In this enumeration, we must pass by those whose public life was mainly occupied with questions, whether of foreign or home policy, which did not reach their solution in the nineteenth century and

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Trevelyan, G. M., *The Life of John Bright* (1913), p. 386.

some of which remain unsolved at the present day<sup>1</sup>. Among these were, on the conservative side, at least one statesman of commanding personality—Robert Cecil, third marquis of Salisbury—who, without ever quite laying aside the ‘flouts’ and ‘gibes’ of less responsible days, and often, seemingly, careless of the immediate effect of indiscretions which would have shaken the trust in the self-control of a lesser man, impressed large audiences as well as the discerning few with his fitness to guide the vessel of state through storms or shoals.

The life of Joseph Chamberlain ended only yesterday, but in the chief campaign which it was not given to him to carry to an issue, he had exercised too potent an influence upon the future of the British empire to make it easy to pass by his name in silence in the present connection. But the whole of his parliamentary career, shortened as it was by physical failure, falls outside the limits within which we judge it right to confine this chapter.

On the other hand, the main transactions and interests of two generations of the national history seem to gather themselves into the threescore years of the public career of William Ewart Gladstone, and into the oratory which gives expression to every stage and aspect of it; though it is only the earlier portion of that career on which we can here dwell. Brought up, as he said, in his native Liverpool under the shadow of the name of Canning, welcomed at the outset of his parliamentary life by Peel, the most talented member of Aberdeen’s new ministry of all the talents, wooed by the tories and indispensable to the whigs, and head of four successive administrations, he ended as the chosen chief of the democracy which he had helped to call into life. To very few other great statesmen of any age has it been given so indissolubly to unite with his name and fame as a statesman those of the orator who expounded, commended and placed on record the chief undertakings of his political genius—unless, indeed, it be thought fit to compare him to the master-spirit who of old both perfected and controlled the Attic democracy. In the year before Gladstone’s death, he made the remark that, as to politics, the basis of his mind was laid principally in finance and in philanthropy—no very strange combination if, by the side of some of the most brilliant triumphs of his oratory, the series of budget speeches, be placed his ardent efforts on behalf of the

<sup>1</sup> Of some distinguished divines, lawyers and men of letters whose parliamentary oratory added to their renown, the names will be found in other chapters, and in the bibliography.

suffering Christian subjects of the Turk. But the saying cannot be accepted as adequately indicating either his chief intellectual interests or all the most vitalising elements of his inexhaustible eloquence. On the threshold of manhood, the bent of his mind had been towards the clerical profession; and for some time he continued to contemplate secular affairs 'chiefly as a means of being useful in church affairs.' When, six years after entering parliament, he produced his celebrated book entitled *The State in its Relations with the Church* (1838), he took his stand on the principle that the state must have one religion, and that must, of course, be the religion which it had recognised as the true. From this view, he gradually passed to the acceptance of freedom of religious opinion, coupled with the conviction that the preservation of truth may be left in other hands than ours<sup>1</sup>, and thus fulfilled Sheil's prophecy that the champion of free trade would become the advocate of the most unrestricted liberty of thought. But, even after he had ceased to stand forth as the champion of the church he loved, religious feeling continued to be the woof that crossed the warp of his noblest and most stirring eloquence.

Nor, again, is it possible, in considering the characteristics of his oratory, to mistake the extraordinary fineness of its texture, or to refuse to attribute this, in part, to the congenial dialectical training of a singularly subtle mind. Gladstone was a classical scholar, whose imagination delighted to feed on Homer<sup>2</sup>, and whom a stronger intellectual affinity had familiarised with the pearls of Vergilian diction; while, among modern literatures, he loved the Italian with a fervency that inspired in him his earliest incursion into the domain of foreign affairs and his first endeavours on behalf of oppressed national aspirations. But he could not be called either a man of letters, or thoroughly trained in the methods of scholarship. On the other hand, he was, as a logician, trained in the use of the whole armoury of the schools, and employed it habitually and without effort. It was a humorous criticism which, in the days of his still incomplete economic conversion, described one of his speeches as consisting of arguments for free trade and of parentheses in favour of protection; but, in his later, as well as in his earlier, days, he thoroughly understood, and applied with consummate skill, the defensive side of the science of debate, including the use of reservation. No doubt he had what may be described as the excesses of some of his qualities, and there was

<sup>1</sup> Morley's *Life of Gladstone*, vol. III, p. 19 (speech on Affirmation bill).

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *ante*, vol. XII, p. 834.

point in the advice of his intimate friend Sir Thomas Acland that, in speaking on the Jewish emancipation question (1847), he should be as little as possible like Maurice, and more like the duke of Wellington.

Those who think of Gladstone as an impassioned orator are apt to overlook the fact that, in the earlier part of his career, he very rarely gave occasion for being thus described; indeed, his platform triumphs belong almost exclusively to his later life, and his ascendancy in the house of commons had not been gained by carrying it away, but by convincing it—at times, as it were, in spite of itself. The gifts of voice and personality remained with him almost to the last—the magic voice of which, after his great budget speech of 1860, he was admonished to take care not to destroy the colour, and the personality which disdained all the small animosities of political conflict. And, with these, he retained the lucidity of arrangement and exposition which rendered his most complicated statements of facts and figures not only intelligible but enjoyable—a gift which had been the most notable quality of his middle period. To these, had, in his latter days, been added, in fullest measure, the animating influence of indignation and the prophetic note of aspirations for the future. Of few great political orators of modern times has there been preserved so luxuriant a store of recorded eloquence.

Gladstone, whose title to be regarded as the foremost political orator of his century few will be disposed to dispute, was, also, in this country, at all events, the most effective of political pamphleteers. Thrice, above all, in the course of his life he intervened in this way in the course of European politics—for his two *Letters to the Earl of Aberdeen* (on the state prosecutions of the Neapolitan government, 1851); his *Vatican Decrees in their Bearing on Civil Allegiance* (1874), with its sequel *Vaticanism* (1875), and his *Bulgarian Horrors and the Question of the East* (1876), followed by *Lessons in Massacre* (1877), sensibly affected the development of some of the most important political problems of the times. Nor were these the only occasions on which it seemed to him expedient to address a wider public than could be reached by the actual accents of his voice or the reports of his speeches; and, even after the greatest catastrophe of his political life, the defeat of the Irish Home Rule bill of 1886, and the ratification of this result by an adverse general election, he sat down to compose a double-barrelled pamphlet on the Irish question.

Gladstone's pamphlets do not stand alone as memorable expressions of opinion put forth by noted British politicians in the nineteenth century. To those dating from the period which may be held to close with the deaths of Cobbett and Godwin (1835 and 1836), there is no necessity for returning here<sup>1</sup>. The following period had its new themes, in addition to the old, connected with political reform, religious freedom and economic progress, and with the support of the expanding struggle for the claims of nationalities. So early as 1836, Cobden published the earliest pair of a long series of pamphlets, of which the second, provoked by the 'indiscretions' of David Urquhart, brought to a head in a pamphlet by that truculent ex-diplomatist, ably combated any attempt at armed intervention against the eastern policy of Russia. Cobden's pamphlets deserve a notable place in our political literature, and, among the large number of publications of this kind produced by the French invasion panic of 1852—3, his *1792 and 1853* was a protest of much more than passing significance. Bright was capable of writing vigorous public letters; but his pen was not a favourite weapon with him as it was with Cobden and with W. J. Fox. Bright's chief adversary in the battle of franchise, Lowe, was born and bred a pamphleteer. He had taken up arms against the famous tract which brought to a close the most notable series of religious pamphlets known to our literature; and, during his sojourn in Australia, he contributed to the discussion of the land question in that continent a luminous address which went to the very root of the problem (1847). But, on his return to England, his political activity as a pamphleteer soon merged into that of a journalist.

And such (to conclude this brief note) might seem, with exceptions which almost prove the rule, to be the inevitable tendency in this later age of political writing designed to produce an immediate effect. Journalism has not destroyed the pamphlet; but the greater part of its activity has for some time seemed to be absorbed by an organised form of publication which provides both writers and readers with opportunities that are at once more rapid, more facile and more commanding. The future only can show whether the irrepressible desire of individual opinion to find wholly independent expression, together with the recurrence of great crises in which every voice capable of making itself heard finds solace and encouragement in accomplishing this, will suffice to keep alive a form associated with many great names in our literature as well as with many important or interesting epochs of our history.

<sup>1</sup> Cf., *ante*, vol. XI, chap. II.

## CHAPTER III

### CRITICAL AND MISCELLANEOUS PROSE

JOHN RUSKIN AND OTHERS

THE critical and miscellaneous prose of the Victorian age is a somewhat unmanageable subject, both because of its volume and because of its variety. Classification is extremely difficult. There are some writers who must clearly be ranked as literary critics and others who, for want of a better word, may be said to belong to the aesthetic school. Others, again, because of that charming note of personal friendliness for which Lamb is supreme, may be described as essayists *par excellence*. But how are we to classify Borrow; or Lafcadio Hearn, the interpreter of Japan? And is there any one class which will hold at once the author of *Modern Painters* and the author of *Munera Pulveris*?

The line of which the evolution is clearest is that of literary critics, and it will be convenient to treat first those who can be classified under this head.

The critics of the Victorian age inherited from Lamb, Coleridge, Hazlitt and Carlyle a tradition which was certainly more wholesome than that which had prevailed in the days of Gifford and Jeffrey; and, thanks to this tradition, criticism grew decidedly more urbane. The oldest of this group by many years was Abraham Hayward, who is now, perhaps, best known as author of *The Art of Dining*, a volume made up, like much of Hayward's work, of contributions to periodicals written long before their separate publication. But Hayward began with work of a widely different sort—a very good prose translation of *Faust*; and he never abandoned his interest in Goethe. Near the end of his life, he himself published a volume on the poet whom he had begun by translating. He was interested in other foreign writers also, and contributed to *The Edinburgh Review* articles on the countess Hahn-Hahn and on Stendhal, at a time when these authors were hardly known in England. Hayward could draw a good biographical sketch or build up a very readable article out of

anecdotes, just as he made his reputation in society from the same materials; and his articles on contemporaries, such as those on Sydney Smith and Samuel Rogers, are valuable for their personal reminiscences. He could also construct an ingenious argument, as in his *More about Junius*. But, for critical principles, we search his works in vain. Somewhat akin to Hayward in his love of anecdote, though inferior to him, was John Doran, the pleasant author of *Knights and their Days* and *Their Majesties' Servants*. The latter contains much information, but seems to have no clear end in view, and has little depth of scholarship.

Doran's reputation among contemporaries is evidence that the level of criticism about the middle of the nineteenth century was low. It was, however, soon to be raised. Ruskin, who, incidentally, is a critic of literature as well as of painting, published his first volume of real weight in 1843. *The Germ*, the organ of the pre-Raphaelites, appeared in 1850<sup>1</sup>. And Matthew Arnold's earliest critical essay was prefixed to his *Poems* of 1853. That stirring of the spirit which their appearance indicated was shown, also, in the critical work of George Brimley, whose feeble health, resulting in an early death, alone prevented him from winning a great name. His most notable criticism, and the only one to which he affixed his name, was the essay on Tennyson which appeared in *Cambridge Essays* in 1855. Though he is less than just to Tennyson's *Poems* of 1830, holding that they 'scarcely reach the altitudes of common sense,' and condemning the 'perverse, unreal treatment' in the poems inscribed with the names of women, yet, with perfect comprehension, he traces the evolution of Tennyson's art from 1830 to 1842. While none of the other essays can rank with that on Tennyson, they are generally right in tone and substance.

In the case of Brimley, principles are rather implied than stated; they are to be inferred from his judgments on particular works. The attempts in English to make the statement of a principle the main object have been few and incomplete; but, among the few, that of Eneas Sweetland Dallas deserves honourable mention. Both by blood and by training, Dallas was drawn towards a philosophical treatment of his subject, for he was of Scottish parentage, and he studied at Edinburgh under Sir William Hamilton. His journalistic career carried him, at times, far enough away from philosophy; but, when he had leisure to write a volume, his thoughts took a philosophic cast—both in the somewhat immature *Poetics*, an *Essay on Poetry*, and in that unhappily

<sup>1</sup> See, *ante*, vol. XIII, chap. v.

named book, *The Gay Science*. How he came to write, also, the pseudonymous *Kettner's Book of the Table, a Manual of Cookery*, it is not altogether easy to understand. *The Gay Science* is, certainly, one of the most remarkable works of its class that we possess. It is, first of all, lucid both in thought and in style; and it is suggestive in a very rare degree. The preface proclaims that the author's purpose is 'to settle the first principles of Criticism.' But, while Dallas feels himself to be a pioneer, he is not unconscious of the limits of his actual achievement, and admits that he has done little more than lay down the groundwork of a science. It must be remembered that his design was never carried to completion; there were to have been four volumes, but only two were written. The incurable English distrust of system condemned the book to oblivion. *The Gay Science* is psychological from the foundation, and, in more points than one, anticipates by a generation the development of opinion. In nothing is this anticipation more remarkable than in Dallas's view of what is now called the subliminary self. This, he holds, lies at the root of all art. Aristotle's theory that art is imitation, is, in his opinion, false, and 'has transmitted an hereditary squint to criticism.' What art does is not to imitate what any eye can see, but, rather, to bring into clear vision what is first apprehended only by 'the hidden soul.' Art has to do with pleasure, but not alone with the pleasure which the sensual man recognises as such; there is hidden pleasure, as well as a hidden soul. It is everywhere the subliminary self which is active in art, and the subliminary self to which true art appeals. Dallas prided himself most of all on his analysis of imagination, and imagination he pronounced to be 'but another name for the automatic action of the mind or any of its faculties.' Everywhere, then, *The Gay Science* moves in the region of ideas. Dallas has a refreshing confidence that there is a cause for everything in art as well as in physical science: a cause, for example, why the earlier poets of modern civilisation delight most of all in sunrise, while those of the nineteenth century delight in sunset. This is clearly an importation, through Hamilton, of the German spirit; and, if Dallas appears to be guilty of that excess with which he charged German criticism—that it is 'all idea'—it must be remembered that his work is incomplete, and that the unwritten concluding volumes would have redressed the balance.

On a lower plane stood James Hannay, who had ended a naval, and begun a literary, career before he was twenty. It was not unnatural that his experience in the navy should suggest the



possibility that he might follow in the steps of Marryat, and *Singleton Fontenoy* and a collection of short stories are based upon that experience. But the knowledge of a boy could furnish no such groundwork as Marryat's long years of storm and battle. Hannay turned, rather, to criticism, and, in the essays contributed to *The Quarterly Review*, which were afterwards reprinted, as well as in the lectures entitled *Satire and Satirists*, he showed taste and judgment.

About the same time, both Walter Bagehot and Richard Holt Hutton began to write. They were associated for nine years as joint editors of *The National Review*; and Hutton's fine memoir of his colleague bears testimony to the closeness of their friendship. Of the two, Hutton, though far the less gifted, was, as a literary critic, the more influential; for Bagehot was, essentially, a publicist, and his *Literary Studies*, a collection of papers contributed to *The National Review* from the early fifties onwards, are little more than a by-product; while, in Hutton's case, notwithstanding the theological inclinations shown in a volume on cardinal Newman, in *Aspects of Religious and Scientific Thought* and in one of the volumes of *Essays, Theological and Literary*, the critical element is the most important. Yet, Hutton is rarely free from some preoccupation which is not purely literary. His personal tastes, first of all, were theological; and, in literature, he most willingly dealt with writers in whom some theological interest was either latent or explicit. It was partly, at least, this that made him the consistent though discriminating admirer of the verse of Matthew Arnold. He detected that undertone in Arnold to which critics indifferent to such interests have been deaf. On the other hand, this preoccupation narrowed Hutton's range. To purely aesthetic considerations he was not highly sensitive, and his criticisms are not, intrinsically, of very great value. But Hutton was more than himself. For over thirty years he was one of the editors of *The Spectator*; in no small degree he impressed upon that journal his own character; and, in estimating his significance, heed must be paid to the great influence it wielded under his control.

Bagehot was an editor, too; but the most important part of his editorial career was that in which he conducted *The Economist*. It thus emphasises his work as economist and publicist rather than his work as literary critic, and readers will grieve or rejoice according to their taste. Undoubtedly, Bagehot had gifts that would have secured great success in either sphere. If his reputation is, even now, below his deserts, it is probably because

his interests were varied and his energies, in consequence, dissipated. He is at once biographer, critic, economist and publicist. In his critical essays, the keen incisive phrases, the humour, the penetrating analyses of character, the touches of philosophy, give the impression of the presence of a great man. Bagehot was never content to play upon the surface, he sought to penetrate to the principle underneath. He had the qualifications requisite to make him what Dallas called a systematic critic. But, as he did not choose to concentrate himself upon literature, his criticism, though brilliant, remains fragmentary. In *Biographical Studies*, another collection of contributions to periodicals, Bagehot's interest in politics comes into the foreground. Even in his literary essays it could not be entirely suppressed: there is, for example, an analysis of the forms of social organisation in the paper on Sterne and Thackeray. In other respects, his biographical sketches show much the same qualities as his literary essays; and the resemblance is all the closer because his critical essays largely depend for their effect upon insight into character. When Bagehot wrote about Shakespeare, he chose, characteristically enough, to lay emphasis on the man, rather than on the poet or the playwright. In *Biographical Studies*, there are the same short crisp sentences that we find in *Literary Studies*, the same epigrammatic point, the same humour, the same abounding life, the same easy, sometimes colloquial, diction.

But it was to his work as economist and as publicist that Bagehot gave the greatest part of his strength. He is at his best in *Lombard Street* and in *The English Constitution*<sup>1</sup>. Some, it is true, have set *Physics and Politics* above either. But *Physics and Politics* has not worn so well as the other two; its contemporary influence was due, not exclusively to its intrinsic merits, but, partly, to a deft application of the conception of evolution to political society, an application which seemed more original than it really was. Yet, the other two books might have been expected to show the more serious signs of wear. The laws of human society at large are more stable than the forms of a given constitution; and political economy has been largely revolutionised since Bagehot wrote. Even the most conservative is now more socialistic than would have seemed possible to Bagehot and to the vast majority of his contemporaries. But, in spite of this, *Lombard Street* and *The English Constitution* are almost as fresh as they were at first. The reason is that they are descriptive

<sup>1</sup> See, *ante*, chap. I.

of an actual state of affairs. No change which has taken place, or which may take place, in the organisation of the money market can invalidate Bagehot's lively and entertaining analysis of the money market of his day. The facts were open to all, yet no one knew how to interpret them till Bagehot, in *Lombard Street*, showed the way. So, too, of *The English Constitution*. It is not a history, but a philosophical discussion. Stubbs and Hallam and May tell the story of three stages of the growth of the constitution; Bagehot appraises the actual values of the elements of the constitution. It was a work no less difficult, no less valuable, than that of the historian, but it called for a gift of a different sort: not the gift of research but that of speculative insight; not learning, but philosophy. Bagehot is comparable, not to Stubbs, but to Burke; and, while he is inferior to the great Irishman, there is no other writer of English to whom, on this his special ground, he need yield the palm. It needed a great mind to penetrate the hollowness of the theory of checks and balances, and to discover that a board of gentlemen with no legal status possesses more real power than either king or lords or commons.

Sir Leslie Stephen showed a similar diversity of interests. The first volume that bore his name was the collection of agreeable essays on mountaineering entitled *The Playground of Europe*; but he had already published anonymously a series of humorous and satirical *Sketches from Cambridge*, and, under initials, a grave statement of the case for the North in the United States civil war. Yet another vein is opened in *Essays on Free Thinking and Plain Speaking*; for Stephen was one of the numerous men of letters who were troubled by the difficulty of reconciling modern thought and the discoveries of modern science with traditional beliefs. Before this volume appeared, however, Stephen had become editor of *The Cornhill Magazine*, a post which he held from 1871 till 1882, when he assumed the still heavier burden of editing *The Dictionary of National Biography*. Stephen seems to have felt, at times, that editorial work was drudgery; but, at least, as contributor to *The Cornhill Magazine*, he had a free hand; and the three series of *Hours in a Library* made up of his articles may fairly be taken to show him at his best as a critic. On the other hand, the plan of the great *Dictionary* necessarily limited his freedom, and the 378 articles covering 1000 pages which he contributed to it must be read with this consideration in view. They are, essentially, biographical, and only incidentally critical. The necessity of thus conforming to a plan, however,

meant to Stephen by no means what it would have meant to such a critic as Coleridge or as Arnold. That his natural bent was towards biography is shown not only in his *Studies of a Biographer*, but in all his fine contributions to the two series of 'English Men of Letters,' and, above all, in the admirable monograph on Johnson. Stephen's most ambitious and weightiest books, however, lie outside the sphere both of literary criticism and of biography. They are contributions to philosophy—*History of English Thought in the Eighteenth Century* and *The English Utilitarians*—and have been considered elsewhere in the present volume<sup>1</sup>. Like the fine essay, *An Agnostic's Apology*, they reveal Stephen as a rationalist, and suggest an explanation of his limits as a critic. His ear was keen for what is heard in literature, but a little dull to what is *overheard*; and, so, he is apt to be warmer in writing about the school of Pope than he is when he deals with the romantic poets.

The tendency of periodicals, the contributions to which, until recently, have been unsigned, has been to make the literary life, for a time, flow, as it were, underground. Thus, Leslie Stephen was nearly forty before his name became familiar to the public outside literary circles. Though Richard Garnett was a younger man by several years, a different mode of publication gave him a status in literature earlier than Stephen. He sought fame first as a poet; but, though he had a true lyrical gift, it was neither very strong nor very original; and, so, the poetical strain in him does better service in imparting an aroma to his criticism than when it impels him to write verse. He was a master of the art of writing literary biography, and nothing of the same kind shows a defter touch than his unpretending but masterly primer on Coleridge or his monograph on Carlyle. The most original of his works is *The Twilight of the Gods*, a collection of singular tales in which he shows an unexpected power of sarcasm.

Perhaps the most remarkable instance of the tendency of the periodical to submerge the man of letters is afforded by Theodore Watts-Dunton, a richly gifted critic, a poet and a romancer, who was yet practically unknown by name outside literary circles until he was nearly sixty, and whose earliest independent publication appeared when he was sixty-five. A great mass of valuable criticism is still and, it may be feared, will remain, buried in *The Athenaeum*. But his admirable article on poetry contributed to *The Encyclopaedia Britannica*, and that entitled *The Renaissance*

<sup>1</sup> See, *ante*, chap. I.

of *Wonder in Poetry* in Chambers's *Cyclopaedia of English Literature*, are enough to prove that Watts-Dunton had in rare fullness the qualities which go to make a great critic. He had scholarship, refined taste and a firm grasp of principles; and they are all generously used for the purpose of securing recognition for rising genius. No one did more pioneer work in criticism than he. Nor were Watts-Dunton's gifts limited to criticism: he had the gift of poetry and the gift of the romancer; and he put both at the service of the gypsies whom he had studied for many years—the first in *The Coming of Love* and the second in *Aylwin*. A less conspicuous instance of submergence in the periodical is offered by Sidney T. Irwin, who is more likely to be remembered by the short and slight memoir prefixed to the letters of the Manx poet Thomas Edward Brown, than by articles contributed to magazines and reviews, though these show a gift of keen appreciation as well as of happy expression.

His interest in gypsies brought Watts-Dunton into touch with George Borrow and with Francis Hindes Groome. It was Borrow who first gave gypsies a citizenship in literature, though his knowledge of them, as of many other things, seems to have been wide and general rather than exact. Watts-Dunton's authority is conclusive, and he declares<sup>1</sup> that Borrow's first-hand knowledge of gypsy life was superficial compared with Hindes Groome's; yet Borrow made gypsies live in the English mind as neither Hindes Groome did in his absurdly named and ill-constructed Romany novel *Kriegspiel*, nor Watts-Dunton in *Aylwin*.

In a loose sense, Borrow might be called a scholar, since he knew many languages, and spoke and wrote them freely. He was a traveller, and has told the story of his travels with extraordinary *verve*. He has written books that read wonderfully like picaresque stories; but, in these, *Wahrheit* is so mingled with *Dichtung* that they stand in a class by themselves. On the whole, it seems best to regard him as one of the most remarkable of autobiographers. 'What is autobiography?' he asked. 'Is it a mere record of the incidents of a man's life, or is it a picture of the man himself—his character, his soul?' If, as seems reasonable, we take this to be applicable to *Lavengro* and *The Romany Rye*, it links together the works of Borrow that really matter—these two and *The Bible in Spain*. In the last, no doubt, there is more precise truth of fact, but it is at least possible that there is more perfect sincerity in the less literally true books. The correspondence between Borrow and

<sup>1</sup> *The Athenaeum*, 22 February 1902.

the Bible society, for which he worked, gives evidence that, sometimes, there was friction between that society and its extraordinary colporteur. In *The Bible in Spain*, the adventures ring true; but, though there can be no doubt as to Borrow's hatred of popery and his consequent zeal, of a sort, for protestantism, the piety is, by no means, so convincing. Alike in this book and in the two gypsy tales, Borrow is unsurpassed for graphic power. In *Wild Wales*, he shows the same gift, though not quite in the same degree. Essentially, he is a man of the open air; and few have equalled him in the art of transporting the reader's spirit into the wilderness, while his body sits by the fireplace. His books are planless, as picaresque books are apt to be. Events succeed one another; they are not consequent upon one another. But, nevertheless, the books are held together by the personality of the author; and it is the sense of his personality, in addition to that sense of the open air already mentioned, which makes Borrow eminently readable. By reason of these gifts, Borrow, in the literary sense, is far superior to Hindes Groome. Yet the latter was a very skilful literary craftsman. His sketch of Edward FitzGerald throws a pleasant light on an interesting character, and his paper on his own father, *A Suffolk Parson*, is rich with racy local anecdotes. What neither *Kriegspiel* nor *In Gypsy Tents* could impart was that sense of abounding vitality which sparkles in every page of Borrow.

The Romany group has diverted our attention, for the moment, from the literary critics of the period. Among these, in the latter part of the nineteenth century, William Minto held a respectable position in the second rank; but his writings hardly rise above the level of good journey-work. Henry Duff Traill<sup>1</sup>, a man of higher and more varied gifts, was among those whom the pressure of journalism deprived of the fame which he had the capacity to win. In addition to a considerable critical faculty, which is attested by his monographs on Coleridge and Sterne, and by the essays entitled *The New Fiction*, he had the happy knack of writing light satirical verse, one volume of which, *Saturday Songs*, by its title commemorates his connection with *The Saturday Review*. He also wrote on constitutional and political questions. In *The New Lucian* and in *Number Twenty*, he gave rein to his imagination, and, in the former, he reaches his highest point in pure literature. It was a bold conception, that of writing new dialogues of the dead; and to say that Traill completely succeeded

<sup>1</sup> See, *ante*, vol. XIII, chap. VI.

would be very high praise. He did not. Sometimes his opinions seem to get between him and the character he delineates. Nevertheless, the book shows not merely ability but genius. It is always well written, frequently witty and sometimes eloquent.

There remain two critics who may be taken as specially representative, in the latter part of the nineteenth century, the one of academic, and the other of non-academic, criticism. Edward Dowden was for many years the most widely known of the former group, and William Ernest Henley<sup>1</sup> was the most highly gifted and the most influential of the latter. Both were something more than critics; but what, for the present purpose, may be called the extraneous activities of Dowden were of far less importance than Henley's; for Dowden's graceful and accomplished verse is light in the balance against Henley's virile and varied poetry. And, except for one venture into the realm of the muses, Dowden, until his death remained, what his earliest and best known book proclaimed him to be, a critic. It is rarely that a young man wins fame with a single effort, as Dowden did with *Shakespeare...his Mind and Art*; and still more rarely does a first book remain, at the end of a long and active literary career, the best known and the best liked. This ready acceptance and this permanent fame were due, partly, to the merits of the book, and, partly, to the wide interest felt in Shakespeare. There was plenty of Shakespearean criticism even half a century ago; but it was mostly of what Dallas called the editorial class. Dowden supplied something different and higher—a thoughtful interpretation of the spirit of Shakespeare's work. It was expressed, too, in a style lucid and attractive, though not free from the faults which, long afterwards, were pointed out in Matthew Arnold's pungent essay on Dowden's *Life of Shelley*. For the rest, his numerous essays are invariably scholarly, and they usually show that insight which a genial sympathy gives.

The point where Dowden is weak is just that where Henley is peculiarly strong. No recent critic has been more boldly, and even defiantly, original; none has expressed himself in more striking phrases. Perhaps his greatest service, as a writer of prose, was that he taught the power of incisiveness to a generation which was prone to lose itself in words. His criticisms in *Views and Reviews*, alike in the section devoted to literature and in that devoted to art, are brief—vignettes rather than full-length portraits—but they are pregnant. He plunges at once *in medias*

<sup>1</sup> See, *ante*, vol. XIII, chap. VI.

res, and expresses his views in such a way that, whether the reader agrees with him or differs from him, he can be in no doubt as to the meaning. Sometimes, his views are startling, and even demonstrably false, as when he declares that 'the great First Cause of Romanticism was Napoleon'; sometimes, probably, they are inspired by a spirit of mischief or are drawn from him by the lure of alliteration. But, even when he is wrong-headed, Henley rarely fails to command respect and to provoke thought. At the worst, he is piquant. He was generous in his criticism of contemporaries—with exceptions. As regards writers just before his own time, he is enthusiastic about Dickens and Tennyson, but cold about Thackeray. Henley's longer critical essays, which have been gathered together in the collected edition of his works, display the same characteristics. The most remarkable of them, unquestionably, is the brilliant essay originally contributed to *The Centenary Burns*. It is thorough in scholarship, it is admirably written, it has every gift save that of love.

The nearest akin to literary critics were writers of the aesthetic group, of whom John Ruskin was the greatest. Ruskin is one of the most voluminous and, superficially viewed, one of the most miscellaneous, of English writers. Verse and prose, criticism—aesthetic, literary, social and political—economics, autobiography, all are represented. The thought is sometimes dressed in royal purple and adorned with gold embroidery, sometimes clothed as simply as ever was village maiden. In opinion, again superficially viewed, he is one of the least consistent. Convictions expressed with the utmost confidence in the first edition of a book are scornfully renounced in the second. Yet, Ruskin will never be understood unless the truth be grasped that there is a unity underlying all his diversity, and that, in spite of contradictions on this point and on that, no writer, in essentials, is more consistent. There is evolution from the first volume of *Modern Painters* to *Fors Clavigera*, and to the last volume of *Praeterita*; but there is no fundamental change. Even the gulf which seems to divide the concluding volume of *Modern Painters*, with its analysis of leaf beauty and of cloud beauty, from *Unto this Last*, with its discussion of the nature of wealth, proves, on examination, to be no gulf at all.

Ruskin's father had good taste both in literature and in art, and fostered these tastes in his son. To his mother was due that familiar knowledge of the Bible which is shown in every one of



his works. She and her son read it together from beginning to end, turning to *Genesis* again as soon as they had reached the close of the *Apocalypse*. But there was a disadvantage as well as an advantage in these intimate family relationships. In a sense, Ruskin was never *sui juris* so long as his parents lived; and, affectionate as were his feelings for them, before the end he had begun to chafe at their control as a thing almost intolerably irksome. In his maturity, Ruskin became a heretic in religion and a revolutionary in economics, while his father was orthodox on both points.

In his youth, however, notwithstanding the mistake of over-indulgence and excessive protective care, Ruskin gained enormously from the devotion of his parents. The early journeys of mingled business and pleasure in England supplied much food for eye and mind; and, when Prout's *Sketches in Flanders and Germany* suggested a longer tour, it was promptly undertaken. Similar tours followed, year after year. If, when he went to Oxford in 1837, Ruskin was ill equipped in respect of the ordinary subjects of study, he already knew a great deal more than most of his teachers about the things that, for him, were important. He had laid deep and sure the foundations of *Modern Painters*, the first volume of which was published in 1843; and repeated visits to the continent in after years enriched him with materials for the subsequent volumes, and for much of his other work as well.

Even before the appearance of the first volume of *Modern Painters*, Ruskin was a practised writer. From 1834 onwards, he was a fairly active contributor, in prose to Loudon's *Magazine of Natural History* and *Architectural Magazine*, and in verse to *Friendship's Offering* and *The London Monthly Miscellany*. The verses, with the Newdigate prize poem *Salsette and Elephantia*, and with later contributions to *The Keepsake* and other compilations, were gathered together and reprinted more than half a century after most of them were written. Not till after more than ten years of effort did Ruskin finally make up his mind that, though he could write fluent and melodious verse, he was not a poet. The early prose pieces, being on the true line of development, are of superior interest to the early verses. Some of these prose pieces were included in *On the Old Road*, and a complete series, *The Poetry of Architecture*, was separately reprinted in 1892. Considering the boyish years of the writer, the early essays reveal, in a very remarkable degree, the mature Ruskin. He liked to lay a scientific foundation for his aesthetic theories; and the embryo

man of science is shown in the titles of three early papers—*Enquiries on the Causes of the Colour of the Water of the Rhine*, *Note on the Perforation of a Leaden Pipe by Rats* and *Facts and Considerations on the Strata of Mont Blanc*. Again, in *The Poetry of Architecture*, some of the leading principles which were afterwards developed in *The Seven Lamps of Architecture* and in *The Stones of Venice* are already taught; and, above all, the very title of that early work asserts the central principle of all his aesthetic writings. What he means by the poetry of architecture is, he explains in the sub-title, ‘the architecture of the nations of Europe considered in its association with natural scenery and national character.’ In *Modern Painters*, he declares that the distinctive character of his writings is ‘their bringing everything to a root in human passion or human life.’ This distinctive character, then, is present from the start; and no student of Ruskin can doubt that it remains present to the end. When we turn from substance to style, we find the same harmony between these early essays and the best known of Ruskin’s aesthetic treatises. Alike in diction, in structure and cadence of sentences and in the love of such ornaments as alliteration, the boy is father to the man.

More remarkable, however, than any of the published articles, as an anticipation of the future Ruskin, was a paper written, in 1836, in answer to a ribald criticism in *Blackwood’s Magazine* of the paintings exhibited by Turner in that year. As Turner ‘never moved in these matters,’ the paper was not then printed; and, when Ruskin came to write *Praeterita*, he could find no fragment of it. But he there refers to it as ‘the first chapter of *Modern Painters*,’ and the copy subsequently discovered, which is printed in the library edition of his writings, proves that, at seventeen, he was already, to a surprising degree, master of the principles he enunciated in that work. The gradual expansion of the plan of *Modern Painters* is highly characteristic of Ruskin. In conception, at first, merely a pamphlet in answer to an objectionable critique, it becomes a reasoned examination of a great artist, and, finally, a treatise on art based upon such a view of art that almost anything in heaven or earth becomes relevant. Systematic it is not, although there is a show of system. Ruskin’s mind was, naturally, discursive, and it is fortunate that he was compelled to follow the bent of his mind. The book would have been much less rich than it is had it been really systematic. The success of the first volume was so great, and the vistas of work which

it opened out before him were so vast, that the general lines of Ruskin's future activity were practically determined by it. Seventeen years were to pass before *Modern Painters* itself was finished. The journeys, year after year, through France to Switzerland and Italy not only furnished materials for it, but opened up ever new vistas. *The Seven Lamps of Architecture* and *The Stones of Venice* were both by-works, undertaken and carried through while it was still on hand. All three, in their author's view, were educational works. *Modern Painters* was conceived in a mood of 'black anger' at the ignorance and insensitiveness of England; the author felt he had a mission to dispel the ignorance and to pierce the insensitiveness. Architecture was as little understood as painting; even those who were trying to revive Gothic architecture showed, by their actions, that they knew not what they did. Hence, to expound the nature of Gothic was as essential for the spiritual welfare of the people as was the vindication of Turner. Though Ruskin disappointed the hopes of his parents, who had destined him for the church and who saw in him a future bishop, he was all his life a preacher. The sense of duty, growing ever deeper, compelled him to take up fresh burdens. Thus, in 1850, he intervened on behalf of the pre-Raphaelites, as, in 1843, he had intervened on behalf of Turner. In the latter case, his aid was volunteered; in the former, it was sought; but, in both, it was given from the same sense of duty. He, the man who had vision, was bound to remove the scales from the eyes of the blind. He was all the more bound to the pre-Raphaelites because, working, in the main, independently of him, they were putting into practice in their painting the principles which he was maintaining in his books. Hence, the letters to *The Times* on the art of the brotherhood, and the subsequent pamphlet on pre-Raphaelitism. *Academy Notes*, in which, each year, from 1855 to 1859, he somewhat pontifically instructed the faithful what they must believe concerning contemporary art, were another outcome of the same spirit. These, however, were strictly within the province which Ruskin had made his own. *Notes on the Construction of Sheepfolds*, issued in the same year with *Pre-Raphaelitism*, was much more questionable in every respect. Ruskin had no such authority in the sphere of theology as he had in that of art, and the former work showed that he was altogether incapable of gauging the practical difficulties in the way of a re-union of the sects.

Yet another development of his activities is shown in the

various series of lectures which he delivered during the sixth and seventh decades of the nineteenth century, before his official position as Slade professor of fine art at Oxford made lecturing part of his business. Probably, the closer contact with his audience as lecturer than as writer satisfied his hunger for sympathy. It was, moreover, essential to get all the strength he could upon his side; for 'what with that infernal invention of steam, and gunpowder, I think the fools may be a puff or barrel or two too many for us.' He lectured, therefore, in order to enlist recruits in the army of the wise which was to condense the steam into water and to pour it upon the gunpowder. His lectures *On Architecture and Painting* were delivered in Edinburgh in 1853; *The Political Economy of Art* (afterwards included in *A Joy for Ever*) consisted of two lectures delivered at Manchester in 1857; and in *The Two Paths* were gathered together five lectures which are related by unity of purpose, though they were delivered at different places. These lectures were all directly concerned with Ruskin's primary business, art; but the very title of the second course indicates the change which was coming over him. He was half serious as well as half playful when he wrote to Norton that he wanted to give lectures in all manufacturing towns. He was approaching the great dividing line of his work and life, which he crossed when, in 1860, he published both the last volume of *Modern Painters* and the five essays afterwards known by the title *Unto this Last*.

The last volume of *Modern Painters* had, for the most part, been written in the winter of 1859—60. While it was passing through the press, the author was already busy with his revolutionary essays on economics, the first of which appeared in *The Cornhill Magazine* for August. The outcry against these papers was so great that Thackeray, the editor, at the instance of the publisher, intimated to Ruskin that the series must be stopped. The same fate attended the series of essays contributed in 1862—3, on the invitation of Froude, to *Fraser's Magazine*. The fragment afterwards received the title *Munera Pulveris*. The strong opposition aroused by these papers was due, mainly, to the heterodoxy of Ruskin's opinions. Writing when the Manchester school was at the height of its power, he flatly denied its gospel. But another cause operated to increase the irritation which was felt against him. In the transition from the criticism of art to the criticism of industry, Ruskin seemed to break with his own past; and, while his countrymen were now willing to listen to his exposition of the political economy of the

former, they asked impatiently what he knew about the political economy of the latter. He had given ground for the question by the statement in the preface to *The Political Economy of Art* that he had never read any author on political economy, except Adam Smith<sup>1</sup>.

Ruskin had to create a public for his economics, as he had created one for his aesthetic doctrine. But there was no break and no inconsistency. Evolution there certainly was—an evolution mainly from within, though influenced by Carlyle. The transition from art to industry was the natural outcome of Ruskin's doctrine of art as an expression of the whole life. He knew that life is social, and he felt that the imperfections and the unreality of modern art are intimately related to the ugliness of modern industry. There was, from the first, much in his writings that might have prepared a close student for the transition. He had vigorously protested in *The Seven Lamps of Architecture* against the uselessness of much of the toil to which the working classes are condemned. In *Modern Painters*, he had distinguished the lower picturesque from the higher, and declared that the essence of the difference between them lay in the fact that the lower picturesque was heartless. Most clearly of all, the last volume of *Modern Painters* revealed the drift of his thought. There, he had condemned the modern 'monetary asceticism, consisting in the refusal of pleasure and knowledge for the sake of money';—that is to say, that inverted asceticism which renounces the kingdom of heaven in favour of this world, just as medieval asceticism renounced this world in favour of the kingdom of heaven; he had maintained that, if all physical exertion were utilised, no man need ever work more than is good for him; and, after Carlyle, he had thrown out for the consideration of a mercantile era the doctrine that the best work, whether of soldier or sailor, or of spiritual teacher, or of writer or artist, was never done for pay, but for nothing or for less than nothing—for death.

Just because the development was wholly natural, it proved to be no mere passing phase. Henceforth, Ruskin's writings and his practical work alike proclaim him an economist and social reformer as well as a critic of art. On the practical side, the proof is plain in the guild of St George; while among his writings there are, from *Unto this Last* onwards, two great groups, one in which the

<sup>1</sup> It seems probable that this statement was inaccurate, as Ruskin's annotated copy of Mill's *Political Economy* is now in the British museum (Cook, vol. II, p. 12, note 1). But is there anything in the notes to show the date at which they were written?

aesthetic element is most conspicuous, the other in which it is subordinate to the economic. The increased prominence of the latter element inevitably influenced Ruskin's style. After *Unto this Last*, there is less gorgeousness; but the author's own high opinion of that volume as a piece of English was justified.

During the years which followed *Unto this Last*, the conflict in Ruskin's mind between the aesthetic and the social and economic interests is unmistakable. On the whole, the latter triumph. *The Queen of the Air* belongs to the domain of aesthetics, and so does the report on the Turner drawings in the National Gallery. In *The Cestus of Aglaia*, he laid down the laws of art for the use of schools. But the laws of art prove to be very close to the laws of morals; and, in *The Ethics of the Dust*, which treats of crystallography, there is asserted a similarly close connection between morals and science. In *Sesame and Lilies*, and in *The Crown of Wild Olive*, the predominance of the social over the aesthetic interest is very evident. The former became at once, as it still remains, the most popular of all Ruskin's writings, partly, perhaps, because of the elements of the fanciful and the sentimental in it. Both these books were collections of lectures; for Ruskin still loved to meet an audience. He loved, also, at this time and for years afterwards, to speak through the medium which brought him into contact with the largest number. He entered into several newspaper controversies. These 'letters to the editor' were afterwards collected by an Oxford pupil, and published under the title *Arrows of the Chace*—a volume full of paradox, but full, also, of sparkling and memorable sayings. Of these letters, some belong to the aesthetic, and others to the social, divisions of Ruskin's writings. The remarkable series entitled *Time and Tide by Weare and Tyne* belongs wholly to the social division; and, apart from the letters in *Fors Clavigera*, it was Ruskin's last important contribution, in a direct way, to the subject. Afterwards, he tried in a practical way, by the guild of St George, to further the ends he had at heart.

The unfavourable reception of his economic theories had, probably, caused some discouragement in Ruskin's mind. At any rate, after *Time and Tide* and *The Queen of the Air*, he turned to a study so far removed from economics as Greek mythology. He also occupied himself with such tasks as the production of catalogues of pictures. Then, in 1869, came his appointment to the post of Slade professor of fine art at Oxford; an office to which he was again appointed in 1883.

This (without at all extinguishing his social interests, which were manifested in road-making, street-sweeping and tea-selling, as well as in other less eccentric ways) gave a decisive impetus to the aesthetic element in his mind; for the professorship made aesthetics his business and his duty. He was a busy and highly successful lecturer, delivering, in the year 1870, the series afterwards published under the title *Lectures on Art*, in which, after four introductory lectures of a general nature, he dealt with painting; and that on sculpture, entitled *Aratra Pentelici*. In the following year, he delivered his lectures *On Landscape*, which were not published till 1897, and a much-debated discourse entitled *The Relation between Michael Angelo and Tintoret*. The violent exaggerations of this discourse evoked vigorous repudiations from more than one authority on art, and even put some strain upon Ruskin's relations with one or two of his friends. Before the end of his first tenure of office, he had delivered, in all, eleven courses of lectures. But, besides lecturing and teaching through the eye and hand at Oxford, Ruskin conceived it to be his duty to act as a sort of director general in things of art to all who cared to learn from him; hence, *Mornings in Florence* and *St Mark's Rest* were conceived by him to be part of the work of his chair.

Unfortunately for his own health, Ruskin was not content with the tasks which his enthusiasm for art imposed upon him. Though the professorship had breathed a new life into his work for art, it left him still convinced that the problems raised by modern industry were of vital importance. The guild of St George was conceived at this period, and, in 1871, he started *Fors Clavigera*. By far the greater part of that extraordinary collection of letters, the most comprehensive and the most characteristic of all Ruskin's writings, was produced while he was still Slade professor. Every phase of Ruskin is illustrated in it, except that of the master of gorgeous English. For insight into the range of Ruskin's style, it is only necessary to compare the first volume of *Modern Painters* with *Fors*. All through his career, he had been moving consistently, though with variations due to the nature of his theme, towards greater simplicity. But the simplicity is still eloquent, and, in *Fors*, it is wonderfully flexible; for it has to be adapted successively to every one of the author's interests and emotions.

Overstrain brought on, in the summer of 1878, a serious attack of brain fever; and Ruskin never regained his old vigour. He was active enough, and most discursively active. Science, art,

theology, literary criticism, economics, are all treated with more or less fullness in the writings of the next two or three years. His re-election to the professorship at Oxford meant more lectures, those entitled *The Art of England* and *The Pleasures of England*; but the latter course clearly showed as it proceeded that his mind, in some degree, had lost its balance. He resigned, once more, and, for the remaining years of his life, he produced nothing of importance except the admirable *Praeterita*. This was finished in 1889. The years of life which still remained to him are best described by the phrase which he himself applied to the closing phase of Scott's life—*jours de mort*.

Ruskin is now passing through that period of depreciation which seems to be the lot of all writers who, at any part of their career, have been regarded with exaggerated admiration. Time was when Ruskin was Sir Oracle on art; now, it is frequently maintained that his principles are antiquated, that the world can afford to forget him. It is curious that, in respect of his work as economist and social reformer, opinion has moved in precisely the opposite direction. Though probably few, either of statesmen or of economists, would accept without large reservations the views advocated by Ruskin, these views have influenced life and legislation; and those who bear in mind how closely the two sections of his work were associated in his own mind will doubt whether the aesthetic teaching can be entirely superseded. It was the conviction that while life without industry is guilt, industry without art is brutality, which drove Ruskin to examine the kind of industry by which the modern world escapes guilt—only to fall into brutality. At any rate, the intense humanity which inspires all Ruskin's work, economic and aesthetic alike, can never become antiquated. A false conception of aesthetic principle is fatal to him who holds that art exists for art's sake, but not necessarily to him who holds that the end of art is to raise life from brutality to graciousness.

Nearly all our subsequent aesthetic criticism is derived from, or more or less deeply influenced by, Ruskin. Benjamin Robert Haydon stands quite apart from him. Though a far older man than Ruskin, Haydon, as the author of printed works, comes after him in chronological order; for, even Haydon's *Lectures on Painting and Design*, the earliest of which was delivered in 1835, was not published till near the close of his life; and the fascinating *Autobiography*, which is his sole title to literary fame, was



posthumous. Ruskin's scathing judgment on Haydon as an artist is well known. In *Modern Painters*, he singles out Haydon and Barry as examples of 'the desire of greatness as such, or rather of what appears great to indolence and vanity,' and states that 'nothing except disgrace and misguidance will ever be gathered from such work' as theirs. Whether this be so or not, the *Autobiography* is entirely unaffected. It has that value which must always belong to any sincere revelation of a human soul, and takes a very high rank in that delightful class of books which Ruskin himself afterwards enriched by his charming *Praeterita*. Haydon's *Autobiography* is not, however, except in a very slight degree, a work of aesthetic criticism, and he is connected with this group rather through his paint-brush than through his pen.

It was otherwise with Anna Brownell Jameson. She, too, was greatly senior to Ruskin, and had made a name as a miscellaneous author while he was still a boy. The facility of her style makes her volumes pleasant reading, and her analyses of Shakespeare's heroines won, and have retained, as they deserve, considerable popularity. But the very title of one of her works, *The Loves of the Poets*, is suggestive of superficiality and popularity in the less favourable sense; and the fact that, in her *Characteristics of Women*, she, without qualification, ranks lady Macbeth as intellectually the superior of her husband, proves the suspicion to be well founded. She was in the field before Ruskin, but she was deeply influenced by him, and her various books on different groups of legends and legendary art bear his mark. Ruskin, however, in *Praeterita*, has pronounced a characteristically candid and gently satirical judgment upon her.

But it was in Ruskin's own university that the aesthetic school took root, though its flowers and its fruit were not precisely what he would have desired. The disciples never gave that weight to ethics which the master desired, and, as time went on, they paid it less, rather than more, attention. Of this group, John Addington Symonds may be described as an outlying member, and his principal work, *Renaissance in Italy*, illustrates the weakness of the school to which he belonged. It is lacking in unity and is one-sided, not only in the sense that it dwells upon art and passes lightly over other factors in the history of the period, but, in the treatment of art itself, emphasis is laid upon the emotional element at the expense of the intellectual. Symonds's other works, likewise, fall short of greatness. His poems are accomplished rather than inspired. His literary monographs and criticisms do not rise

much above the average of their kind; and, sometimes, as in *Shakespeare's Predecessors in the English Drama*, they are not sufficiently thorough on the side of scholarship. Symonds's prose style is nearly always too highwrought and too diffuse.

On a far higher plane of literature stands Walter Pater; but he, though he was influenced by Ruskin, is singularly different from the elder writer, and the difference sheds back a light upon the master's theories. Ruskin, bowed with sorrows though he was, remained unconquerably optimistic, and, so long as he was capable of work, he laboured with even excessive hopefulness at schemes of social regeneration. Pater retires from the dust of conflict into an artistic seclusion. The conclusion of his *Studies in the History of the Renaissance* is, in the highest degree, significant. Its teaching is that, to beings like men, beings under sentence of death, but with a sort of indefinite reprieve, the love of art for art's sake is the highest form of wisdom. 'For art comes to you, proposing frankly to give nothing but the highest quality to your moments as they pass, and simply for those moments' sake.' The Oscar Wilde development had not the good will of Pater any more than that of Ruskin; but it logically follows from Pater's principle.

Pater was one of the most fastidious of literary artists. By his artistic theory he was driven to seek perfection of style. If art for art's sake is the highest thing of all, if life is a series of moments and its aim is to make each moment as exquisite as it can be made, it follows that each sentence, in a sense, is an end in itself. The result is a style beautiful indeed—at its best very beautiful—but overlaboured. The purpose partly defeats itself. The whole suffers from the excessive pains bestowed upon the parts, and the reader shares the oppression felt by the writer.

Pater's literary career began with the essay entitled *Winckelmann*, which he contributed, in 1867, to *The Westminster Review*, and this, with other papers contributed to periodicals, constituted the volume which was published in 1873. In the second edition, the conclusion which has been quoted above was omitted, because Pater felt that it might mislead young men. It was, however, subsequently restored; and the conceptions it indicates form the substance of the fine romance, *Marius the Epicurean*, which shows clearly that Pater's own epicureanism was of a very noble sort, but which fails, like every form of epicureanism, to show why any one kind of pleasure should be the pleasure of all. *Imaginary Portraits* followed, and then *Appreciations, Plato and Platonism*

and the charming 'imaginary portrait,' *The Child in the House*. This was the last volume published during Pater's life, but several followed it posthumously. Pater gave a colour of his own to everything he touched. His criticism reveals so much of himself that the question is naturally suggested, whether it reveals as much of the artist or the writer criticised. But it must be remembered that the criticism that does not carry the atmosphere of personality is a singularly dull affair; and, also, that Pater was unusually well endowed with both the emotional and the intellectual gifts of the critic. There are few whose judgments are deserving of closer attention.

While Pater represented the aesthetic movement in its most earnest phase, Oscar Wilde gave utterance to its principles in the language of persiflage. In verse and in prose, in lyrics, in 'trivial comedies for serious people' that sparkled with wit, in essays often bright with raillery and occasionally weighty with thought, he proved that he possessed a remarkably varied genius. *The Ballad of Reading Gaol* and *De Profundis* are the product of his tragic overthrow, and are well worth all that he had previously written.

Of the ill-defined genus miscellaneous prose, there is no species more delightful than that of the essay in the stricter sense of the word, the essay which is the expression of a mood rather than, like Macaulay's, a fragment of history, or, like Matthew Arnold's, a fragment of criticism. Quite a considerable group of essayists in this stricter sense belongs to the Victorian period. The eldest of the group were Hugh Miller and Robert Chambers, both born in 1802, the one in the north, and the other in the south, of Scotland, both, ultimately, editors in Edinburgh. The most valuable of Miller's contributions to journalism have been gathered into books which have a coherence of their own, like *The Old Red Sandstone* and the delightful autobiography *My Schools and Schoolmasters*; but much still remains in the form of scattered essays, of which one volume was published in 1862 and another in 1870. Science, however, on the one hand, and religious controversy, on the other, absorbed most of Miller's energy, and, though he was the greater writer of the two, left him a smaller place, in this particular sphere, than Robert Chambers, the founder, in conjunction with his elder brother William, of *Chambers's Journal*. Both the brothers were busy writers, and the younger had a gift of humour which served him in good stead in the numerous essays which he contributed to his own journal.

It was to Hugh Miller's journal *The Witness* that John Brown contributed his first noteworthy paper. But, though Brown became a man of letters, he never ceased to be a physician. He is doctor in the medical sense as unalterably as Samuel Johnson is doctor in the academic sense. It seems to have been partly by accident, and partly through domestic insistence and encouragement, that Brown gradually became a writer as well as a physician. Hence, his entry was late and his production always remained leisurely. His earliest paper in *The Witness* appeared in 1846, and the total of his work fills only three small volumes. It is fortunate for Brown's fame that the fact is so. His genius was beautiful and delicate rather than robust, and the characteristic charm of his essays is not of a sort that is susceptible of great expansion or of indefinite repetition. The essayists of the personal and confidential type are never voluminous writers. There is, nevertheless, considerable variety in Brown's work. His papers on medical subjects afford pleasant and profitable reading; he is an excellent critic both of art and of literature; he shows great sensitiveness to natural beauty and great power of describing it. But he is happiest of all when he deals with the dog. Here, he is not only unsurpassed but unequalled. The most deservedly famous of all his writings is the beautiful story *Rab and his Friends*. But he has delineated many dogs besides Rab, and always admirably.

While Brown was born a citizen of the Scottish capital, Alexander Smith only became a citizen by adoption. Though seldom read, he is still known by name as one of the 'spasmodic' poets; but, until lately, it was half forgotten that he was also a skilful writer of prose, author of an extremely pleasant story, of the most readable of guide-books, if *A Summer in Skye* may be degraded by that description, and, above all, of *Dreamthorp*, one of the finest volumes of essays since Lamb's. The friends who, shortly after his death, predicted that he would take rank below only a few of the greatest of British essayists, were not bad critics. Smith had the temperament of the essayist and the clearest possible understanding of the principles of the form of art which the essayist attempts. Nowhere in our literature is there a better exposition of the essay as conceived and written by Montaigne than in the second essay of *Dreamthorp*, *On the Writing of Essays*; and there are not many better examples of 'atmosphere' than the title essay.

On a much lower plane stand Smith's two contemporaries,

A. K. H. Boyd and John Skelton. Boyd first became widely known through the volume of pleasant but garrulous and unsubstantial essays entitled *Recreations of a Country Parson*, which he had contributed to *Fraser's Magazine*. It was the earliest of many volumes which continued to appear at short intervals down to 1896, when *The Last Years of St Andrews* was published. There was a stronger fibre in Skelton, whose pseudonym Shirley was subscribed to some of the most readable of the papers contributed to *Fraser's Magazine* and *Blackwood's Magazine* during the latter half of the nineteenth century. From his earliest production *Nugae Criticae* to *The Table Talk of Shirley*, Skelton showed great skill as an essayist, blending in a rare degree the love of nature with the love of books, and imparting both to the reader through a style redolent of the writer's own personality. Skelton was a historian as well as an essayist. Though he is, perhaps, sometimes advocate rather than judge in his essays and books on Mary queen of Scots, they who most widely differ from him in opinion must be sensible of, and grateful for, the charm of his presentation of the case.

Of all this group, the greatest was Robert Louis Stevenson<sup>1</sup>. Versatility was one of Stevenson's most conspicuous qualities, for, besides being the foremost essayist since Lamb and a master of fiction, whether in the form of romance or in that of short story, he was also a dramatist and a poet. The essay, however, was the form in which he first gave promise of his future distinction, and the publication of *Ordered South* may be regarded as his real entrance upon literature. *Ordered South* lifts the veil from Stevenson's life and gives insight into conditions which profoundly affected all his work. It is the essay of an invalid, and an invalid Stevenson was destined to remain till the end. But he was an invalid with the spirit of a robust adventurer. A victim to tuberculosis, who, at times, could scarcely breathe and who seemed to need all his energies in order merely to live, he was a lover of the sea and a daring voyager, and, long after he had reached manhood, still played, with tireless zest, a war-game of his own invention. In his case, broken health did not quench, but rather stimulated, the heroic in his nature. Hence, feeble as was his hold on life, in forty-four years he accomplished far more than the vast majority of those who live the full span in the enjoyment of vigorous health. The body was weak, but the spirit was indomitable. It was the eagerness of his spirit and his keen

<sup>1</sup> See, *ante*, vol. XIII, chap. VI.

sympathy with men of action that saved Stevenson from the besetting sin of the artist in words, the temptation to subordinate meaning to sound.

It was not until the publication of *Treasure Island* as a separate volume in 1883 that Stevenson was generally recognised as a great writer; but, prior to that, he had written and published some short stories and many essays. The records of personal experience which are embodied in *An Inland Voyage* and in *Travels with a Donkey in the Cevennes* are essentially essays. Fugitive papers were gathered into volumes, intimate and confidential, as in *Virginibus Puerisque*, or critical, as in *Familiar Studies of Men and Books*. Both in matter and in manner they were excellent, but they did not make their author famous. Other volumes, akin in spirit and substance, were added in later years—fragments of autobiography and travel, such as *The Amateur Emigrant*, *The Silverado Squatters* and *In the South Seas*, and collections of miscellaneous papers, such as *Memories and Portraits* and *Across the Plains*. In all his work of this class Stevenson is easy, graceful and friendly, except on occasion, when, as in *A Christmas Sermon*, the tone is too lofty for these adjectives. But there, too, he is intimate, and there, perhaps more clearly than anywhere else, he reveals the moral interest which underlies most of his work.

The body of short stories grew along with the essays, and Stevenson was a master of story-craft no less than of essay-craft. He never surpassed some of his earlier tales: *The Pavilion on the Links* and *Thrawn Janet* both appeared before *Treasure Island*. But, among English-speaking people, it is difficult to make a great reputation out of short stories. The stories published under the title *The New Arabian Nights* were supposed to be responsible for the unpopularity and failure of *London*, the periodical in which they originally appeared. Stevenson might, therefore, have added masterpieces such as *Markheim* and *The Beach of Falesa*, and still have remained obscure. But, after *Treasure Island*, he was obscure no longer, and the brilliant success of that excellent story for boys won readers for the essays and the short stories who, save for it, would have paid no heed to them. It made Stevenson a prosperous man, and did much to determine the direction of his subsequent efforts. It was followed by a series of romances—*Kidnapped*, with its sequel *Catriona*, *The Black Arrow*, *The Master of Ballantrae* and

others, down to his masterpiece *Weir of Hermiston* and the unfinished *St Ives*. In these romances, Stevenson is at his best, like Scott, when he is dealing with his native land ; but a comparison with the *Waverley* novels shows that, fine as his work is, it falls decidedly short of the greatest. Only in *Weir of Hermiston* does he for a moment rival Scott. Stevenson was growing till he died, and the wonderful creation of the old judge, one of the best drawn characters in prose fiction, deepens the regret that his days were numbered. Like Dickens, he had the excellent habit of identifying himself with his characters, and this, no doubt, explains his success. He acted their parts while he dictated, and imitated their voices.

In other departments, Stevenson's work was less excellent. The dramas wherein he collaborated with Henley were not very successful ; but it must be added that their failure was largely due to imperfect acquaintance with the conditions of the theatre. Both writers were too highly gifted to produce work destitute of literary merit, and *Beau Austin*, in particular, seems, from this point of view, to deserve more success than it won.

Stevenson has been called the laureate of the nursery, but the title has also been claimed for William Brighty Rands ; and it seems more justly to belong to the elder writer. Certainly, Rands preceded Stevenson, and the latter has nothing finer than Rands's 'Great, wide, beautiful, wonderful World.' From 1864 onwards, in *Lilliput Levee*, *Lilliput Revels*, *Lilliput Lectures* and *Lilliput Legends*, in verse and in prose, Rands was second only to Lewis Carroll and Juliana Horatia Ewing in the production of those books about childhood and for childhood, which are among the most striking features of recent English literature. He wrote, and wrote well, for adults as well as for children. His essays, *Tangled Talk*, are, it is true, disappointing ; but his *Chaucer's England*, though not a work of profound learning, is a very interesting book ; and his *Henry Holbeach, Student in Life and Philosophy*, proves that he was a thinker as well as a skilful writer. The uncertainty of the judgment of contemporaries is vividly illustrated by the fact that this striking book passed almost unnoticed and remains unknown except to students, while Sir Arthur Helps's commonplace *Friends in Council*, which is also the work of a 'student in life and philosophy,' won for its author a high place among writers of the second grade. Helps attempted history, the drama and prose fiction, as well as the dialogue on social questions by which he won his fame. His histories are

treated elsewhere<sup>1</sup>. His dramas are forgotten. His *Realmah* resembles the works of Disraeli in that it is partly political, but it is not, like them, a document of historical significance. His *Brevia*, a collection of short essays and aphorisms, makes conspicuous that lack of substance which is evident in *Friends in Council*. This charge cannot be brought against the thought of William Rathbone Greg, whose *Creed of Christendom*, in spite of its sympathetic moderation, in 1851 fluttered the dove-cots of orthodoxy. *Enigmas of Life*, fully twenty years later, testified to his permanent interest in the ultimate problems of existence. The expression is sometimes striking, but the principal charm of the book arises from the atmosphere of sincerity which pervades it. Greg was a philosophical politician, as well as a philosophical student of religion; and, in *Rocks Ahead* and *Mistaken Aims and attainable Ideals of the Artizan Classes*, and in a number of essays, he showed himself to be by no means easy in mind as to the tendency of the times. Like Bagehot, he saw that democracy was inevitable, and, like Bagehot, he felt that the problem how to give the masses their due share of power without making them all-powerful was still unsolved.

The nursery work of Rands links on, at one point, to the work of Andrew Lang<sup>2</sup>, whose many-coloured fairy books were, of course, not of his own composition, but gathered out of many lands and many ages in the course of his studies in mythology and folk-lore. Lang seemed to have all the necessary gifts of the essayist; yet, already, his essays have lost somewhat of their flavour. Only now and then, as in the lightly humorous philosophy of prefaces in the preface to *The Orange Fairy Book*, does Lang strike the true note firmly; and he has not enough of this quality to keep his essays in permanent remembrance. He dissipated his powers and attempted too much. Folk-lore, the occult, history, the Homeric question, literary criticism—in all he was active. Under such conditions, it was scarcely possible to be quite first-rate in any department. Specialists in each could point out his mistakes; but it remains much to his credit that he never failed to make himself interesting. The fact that, whether right or wrong, he is interesting in every page of his short sketch of English literature is not the least striking illustration of this power.

Two 'rolling stones,' both of whom gathered moss, as the elder hinted in the title of one of his books, were Laurence

<sup>1</sup> See, *ante*, chap. II.

<sup>2</sup> See, *ante*, chap. II, and vol. XIII, chap. VI.



Oliphant and Lafcadio Hearn. Oliphant's books bear testimony to his wanderings. His earliest volume dealt with Khatmanda ; and his next, *The Russian Shores of the Black Sea*, caused him to be consulted when the Crimean war broke out. In two wars, he acted as correspondent of *The Times*. He was in Japan while Japan was still in the medieval stage, and nearly lost his life in an attack in which the weapon of the assailant was a two-handed sword. So stirring a life afforded rich materials for various lively narratives from his pen, and for the essays which were gathered up near the close of his life in *Episodes in a Life of Adventure*. But the most extraordinary episode of all was Oliphant's subjection to the 'prophet' Thomas Lake Harris, whom the disciple believed to be not only a prophet, but 'the greatest poet of the age,' and to whom he surrendered the whole of his property. One outcome of this discipleship was *Sympneumata*, a singular book, the joint composition of Oliphant and his wife, who both wrote, or believed that they wrote, under the dictation of a spirit. Other products were of a very different sort ; for Oliphant seems to have united with this trait of enthusiasm a marked talent for business, which the prophet was shrewd enough to employ for his own benefit. Hence, *The Autobiography of a Joint-Stock Company*, in which Oliphant embodied the knowledge he had gained of the methods of American financiers. In the literary sense, however, Oliphant's most valuable work was the satiric fiction *Piccadilly*, which shows him to have been a keen observer and a penetrating critic of the society of his time. Long afterwards, he returned to the realm of fiction in *Altiora Peto*, and proved that he still retained his old fineness of touch.

Lafcadio Hearn began his career as a contributor to two Cincinnati journals, but it was a subsequent residence at St Pierre, Martinique, that gave him the materials for his first noteworthy work, *Two Years in the French West Indies*. In this, he showed that power to receive and faithfully to reproduce impressions, which was his special gift ; and his position in literature must depend upon this gift as it was exercised in relation to Japan, whither he migrated in 1891. Probably no one can instruct the man of the west about what Japan was before the completion of the process of modernisation so well as Hearn ; but that he does so on the strength of mere impression is shown by the fact that, though he married a Japanese wife, he could neither speak to her or to his children in their own language, nor, after a residence of fourteen years, so much as read a Japanese newspaper. What

is valuable in his work is not his reasoned opinions, but the feeling produced in his soul by what he saw and heard; and it is important to notice, as Gould insists, that what he saw was little more than a blur of colour; for he was 'probably the most myopic literary man that has existed.' Hence, the best of the Japanese books is the first, *Glimpses of Unfamiliar Japan*, because in it he was forced to rely almost wholly on impression. In his later volumes, he reacts on the impressions and injures them. For this reason, the latest, *Japan: An Attempt at Interpretation*, though the most ambitious—for it is an attempt to present in one lordly dish the cream of all he had learnt about Japan—is far from being equal to those early glimpses. Besides scenes, Hearn produced tales, both in America and in the Japanese period. He betrays in them an unhealthy love of the gruesome; but he could, on occasion, rise to a high level, as he proved by his masterpiece in this form, the story of *Karma*.

While Oliphant and Hearn found their literary capital in the distant and unfamiliar, the sphere of Richard Jefferies was, as the title of one of his volumes indicates, the fields and the hedgerows around us. His task was to show that the unfamiliar lay beneath men's eyes. He belongs to the class of field naturalists like White of Selborne, and, in days more recent than even those of Jefferies, Denham Jordan, who is better known by his pen-name 'A Son of the Marshes.' But Jefferies was more ambitious than they and wider in his range. In *Hodge and his Master*, he deals with the human element in rural life; but he does not show that complete comprehension which he shows of beast and bird and flower. His name first became familiar through *The Gamekeeper at Home*; and, for the ten years of life which remained to him, he was a diligent writer. All who are qualified to judge, testify to his accuracy of observation as recorded in volume after volume, down to *Field and Hedgerow*, which appeared after his death; but, while the style is good, there is a marked tendency to catalogue minute facts which, doubtless, have a value as natural history, but hardly any from the point of view of literature. On the other hand, a certain vein of poetry is present in all the works of Jefferies. It is especially rich in *Wood Magic*, and it gives charm to the fine spiritual autobiography, *The Story of My Heart*.

## CHAPTER IV

### THE GROWTH OF JOURNALISM

To pass from the conditions recorded in the chapter entitled 'The Beginnings of English Journalism'<sup>1</sup> to those with which the close of the nineteenth century was familiar, is almost like being carried on the magic carpet of oriental romance from the middle of the Sahara to the bustling, electricity-lighted thoroughfares of a modern European capital. The chapter to which reference is made treats of the hand-written letter in which some, more or less professional, observer, for the benefit of a few known subscribers in the country, detailed whatever gossip he was able to pick up in the taverns and streets of London. His lineal descendants are still to be seen in the writers of the London letter which figures in the columns of nearly every daily provincial paper, and finds, latterly, a counterpart in several of the journals established in London. The information in these London letters differs, for the most part, from that which is to be obtained in the ordinary news columns, and has nothing in common with the reasoned leading article, in which is discussed the uppermost political incident of the day. The chapter above referred to took its readers from these manuscript letters through various experiments in printed news-books and sheets of intelligence, issued by, or in behalf of, groups of politicians, or news purveyors, to the establishment of *The London Gazette* and the few occasional journals which made their appearance towards the end of the seventeenth century. The transition from a small pamphlet containing some definite piece of news, and bearing an appropriate title, to the sheet published periodically under a distinctive and regularly repeated name, carrying not one but a great variety of collected items of news, was, in itself, great; but, when the change was brought about, the convenience and attractiveness of it ensured permanence.

<sup>1</sup> See, *ante*, vol. VII, chap. XV.

There was even a public ready for the news writer. Howell, in his *Familiar Letters*<sup>1</sup>, tells that the ploughman, the cobbler and the porter would spare no effort to educate their children, and the records of the university of Cambridge show numerous instances of the sons of husbandmen being entered as students. Apart, then, from the necessity to the merchant and trader of being acquainted with current events, it is natural that the country, as a whole, should wish to be supplied with news. Dr Johnson characterised English common folk as more educated, politically, than the people of other countries, and this because of the popularity of newspapers. The extent of the influence of the cheap newspaper in the early part of the eighteenth century is shown by the petition of publishers against the legislation described by Swift as ruining Grub street by the imposition of a tax which extinguished all halfpenny newspapers and many of the more highly priced. It was urged that halfpenny newspapers were used very largely throughout the country as a means of teaching children to read, and that, without them, there would be a failure in this respect. In these conditions, statesmen could not fail to recognise that the newspaper press might be made to serve their purposes, and they did not hesitate to employ men of marked ability and political knowledge to supplement or give finish to the work of the professional inhabitants of Grub street. For these higher services, payment was made, sometimes in coin—Swift says that he refused £50 offered to him by Harley in 1710—11—and, otherwise, by state or church preferment, or by admission to social comradeship. Publishers of newspapers, also, found it to their profit to employ writers who could mix the useful with the pleasant.

The growth of journalism in the eighteenth century was expedited by Palmer's establishment of a series of stage coaches, leaving London at stated hours and carrying parcels as well as passengers, distribution being thus much more rapid and regular than when it depended upon the older waggon. Meanwhile, newspapers had to struggle against the hand of authority. Prosecutions for libel were numerous, and daring writers had to stand in the pillory, besides being imprisoned and fined. Parliament, in especial, was jealous of the news collector; though, now and again, some member might protest that the constituencies had a right to know how their parliamentary representatives spoke and voted, leading politicians and the houses, as a whole, resented,

<sup>1</sup> Section VIII, Letter VIII (circa 1646).

as breaches of privilege, any account of their proceedings, and Cave, one of the earliest and most celebrated of parliamentary reporters, recorded the discussions as if they took place in China, referring to individual statesmen by entirely fictitious names, which, like those employed in *Gulliver's Travels*, were, doubtless, understood by very many readers. Nor were prosecutions for the publication of parliamentary reports confined to London. Quite early in the eighteenth century, some of the leading provincial cities and boroughs could boast their own newspapers. *The Newcastle Courant* was established in 1711, and its publication continued into the second half of the nineteenth century. *The Liverpool Courant* was printed in 1712, *Berrow's Worcester Journal* in 1709, *The Salisbury Postman* in 1715, *The York Mercury* about 1720, *The Leeds Mercury* and *The Northampton Mercury* in 1720. Manchester, somewhat late in the field, had a newspaper, *The Gazette*, in 1730. Cave, in 1722, sent reports of the proceedings of parliament to *The Gloucester Journal*, whose owner, thereupon, was brought into direct conflict with the house of commons.

Some of the journals in this intermediate period were, in fact, collections of essays; and the writers of the chief among them, such as Swift, Addison and Steele, are dealt with in other chapters. Johnson's essays, for the most part, were, like those of Goldsmith, written as the literary attractions of news-sheets; it being recognised that the public, while eager to buy current news, wanted, also, some more substantial and lasting literary food. Like similar efforts of journalism at the end of the nineteenth century, they were composed with rapidity, recording momentary impressions aroused, probably, by some piece of current gossip; being, in this respect, entirely removed from the earlier essay associated with the name of Bacon. Through the whole period, however, is to be noted a constant progress in the collection and dissemination of news.

Charles Lamb divided books into two classes, one of which is literature, and the other not; and, perhaps, it may be said that some journalism is literature and other is not. A sketch of journalism in the nineteenth century must include both, whether or not it attempts to differentiate between them. In any reasoned survey of the period, it is impossible to ignore among newspaper writers a changing attitude which synchronised with a change in their readers. The journalism of the beginning of the century was, mainly, intended for the wealthy and educated classes, though

underneath it was a stratum of popular writing struggling against authority which gladly would have suppressed it; at the end, with the exception of a few weekly reviews—and, perhaps, of a few penny daily papers, and of *The Times*—journalism appealed to a lower average of social standing, and, making allowance for educational progress in the nation, to a lower average of literary appreciation. The enormous circulations of which today certain newspaper owners loudly boast result, largely, from an endeavour to cater for classes whose education has been restricted to the elementary school, or who, of more advanced schooling, always run with the crowd—possibly a tendency natural to democratic times. Writing so near to these developments, it would be premature to pronounce judgment upon them.

As to amenities, journalism, in many ways, has improved during the century. No journal in the front rank would now apply to a rising statesman language such as *The Times*, in the early forties, used about Macaulay, when it referred to him as ‘Mr Babbletongue Macaulay,’ and said, ‘he was hardly fit to fill up one of the vacancies that have occurred by the lamentable death of Her Majesty’s two favourite monkeys.’ One may suppose that Sir Walter Scott had such conditions in mind, when, having dissuaded his son-in-law Lockhart from journalism, he wrote: ‘none but a thorough-going black-guard ought to attempt the daily press, unless it is some quiet country diurnal.’ Dickens’s sketch of Eatanswill journalism was very little of an exaggeration. On the other hand, it is doubtful whether, in the closing years of the century, there was such intimate connection between journalism and writers upon whose work time will impress the hallmark of literature, as in the first half of the century. The newspaper work of Coleridge was done in the last years of the eighteenth century, and the beginning of the nineteenth. Many of Hazlitt’s criticisms of literature, art and the drama were written for daily or weekly journals. Perry, proprietor and editor of *The Morning Chronicle*, complained of the length of Hazlitt’s dramatic criticisms; but the public for which the journal was written looked for articles which, in the literature of the country, have taken a position far above that accorded to the writings of any dramatic critic—and there were several of distinguished ability—at the end of the century. Charles Lamb, also, was a dramatic critic, and, although what he did, in this domain, is of less value than much of his other writing, it possesses permanence, because a man so steeped as was Elia in

Elizabethan literature could scarcely fail to invest his criticism with atmosphere<sup>1</sup>.

In regard to another branch of art, if we turn to Lamb or to Hazlitt, by way of gauging the alteration in the attitude of critics—and, therefore, apparently, of their readers—towards painting, we find that criticism, at the beginning of the century, dealt with the artist's ability to imagine and realise some scene or incident, taking for granted all questions of technique and of what, nowadays, is styled decorative pattern, whereas, recent art criticism has been more and more devoted to these<sup>2</sup>. Hazlitt, who, like many modern critics, had received, unprofitably, some training as a painter, protests against the idea that a critic ought to possess practical acquaintance with the art, and the protest involves the belief that a critic, writing for the public, has nothing to do with the artist's craftsmanship. The alteration of attitude has thus been enormous, and, intellectually, the later outlook is smaller. In the political world, also, while the average of writing, and, possibly, of instructed thought, no matter to what side or party it may be devoted, has, doubtless, improved, there is now less direct connection between statesmen of the first rank and journalism. Greville could point to articles in *The Morning Chronicle* of the fifties as attributable either to Palmerston or to the ambassador of Napoleon III; *The Times* could make and maintain an unique reputation abroad, because it was supposed to voice the opinions of important members of the British government. Henry Reeve, who, between 1840 and 1855, wrote for *The Times* 2482 leading articles, characteristically dwelt, in his journal, on the surpassing value of his knowledge of cabinet matters. Perhaps, allowance must be made for his pride in his work; but the association between cabinet ministers and certain newspapers was, undoubtedly, intimate in the first half of the century. On the other hand, a large degree of independence was shown, and, although great editors might, not unnaturally, be influenced by the society in which they moved, they did not come under suspicion of corruption. Their general

<sup>1</sup> Much dramatic criticism by Leigh Hunt, as, later, that by G. H. Lewes, comes within the same class, being based on literary principles.

<sup>2</sup> As an instance, in the case of Charles Lamb, may be cited the papers he wrote for *The Athenaeum* in 1833. There is no mention of Titian's brushwork. Lamb's interest in the Ariadne lay in the artist's conception of the situation indicated by Ovid, and his power of impressing this conception upon the mind of an intelligent observer. This, also, was Thackeray's standpoint, in his criticisms of paintings.

character, in this respect, appears in a letter from earl Grey to princess Lieven in 1831 :

I saw the article last night in *The Courier*, and it vexed me very much. We really have no power over that, or any other paper in great circulation. All that we can do is by sending them sometimes articles of intelligence (but even to this I am no party) to conciliate them, when public opinion is not against us. But when there is a strong general feeling, as in the case of Poland, it is quite impossible to control them.

Lord Palmerston, in reply to Horsman, who had insinuated that he was influencing *The Times*, protested that, between himself and Delane, there was no bond but that of ordinary social intercourse. At the present day, though, occasionally, information is given privately by ministers to journalists, the latter have grown more and more shy of seeming to be under the influence of ministers ; they are afraid lest a reputation of this kind should damage them in public estimation. Ministers, on their part, have adopted a somewhat different method of appealing to the public, or to foreign powers. The development of reporting, and of the transmission of news, has led them chiefly, though not invariably, to make their appeals from the public platform, or from their places in parliament. This change has caused the political pronouncements of our leading journals to be regarded as less weighty. How far they represent a large mass of public opinion is always debatable ; a political party having the support of the great majority of journals with large circulations has, at times, gone to the country only to find itself in a very decided minority. In sum, therefore, journalism would seem to have lost authority because statesmen have adopted other means of publishing their views, while it has not gained materially in influence derived from a pretension to represent the general trend of opinion in the country, or, what is even more questionable, to direct this opinion. In 1888, there arose a controversy as to whether journalism was advancing or retrograding. *The Spectator* held that the influence was declining yearly. Matthew Arnold, in 1887, describing what was known as the new journalism, said :

It is full of ability, novelty, variety, sensation, sympathy, generous instinct; its one great fault is that it is feather-brained. It throws out assertions at a venture, because it wishes them true;...and to get at the state of things as they truly are, seems to have no concern whatever<sup>1</sup>.

Prophets, in journalism or politics, are always unsafe.

Two features of newspaper work which had their rise in the

<sup>1</sup> *The Nineteenth Century*, May 1887.



nineteenth century are the leading article and special correspondence discussing foreign affairs, or describing war. The war correspondent, indeed, may be said to have been born, run his full course and expired in the second half of the century. Reputations such as were made by W. H. Russell, of *The Times*, in writing of the Crimean war, or by Archibald Forbes, of *The Daily News*, in the Franco-Prussian war, and Henry Labouchere, describing Paris in a state of siege, are no longer possible. Lord Raglan complained that *The Times* published information which, even with the then limited means of transmission, found its way back to Russia, and interfered with his plans; both French and Germans thought the messages of Forbes and his colleagues similarly detrimental; and, in the war between this country and the Boers, which closed the century, a very severe censorship was set up, which practically extinguished the independence of the war correspondent. In the wars of the earlier part of the twentieth century, military authorities have kept war correspondents very many miles away from the front, and government censorships have come into play, with most striking effect. Foreign correspondents—of whom, Henry Crabb Robinson, sent out by *The Times* in 1807, was one of the earliest—have maintained their position. So, too, has the leading article, despite the judgment of Richard Cobden, when he was one of the proprietors of *The Morning Star*, that ‘people did not like leading articles,’ and also despite the practice, followed by a large part of the halfpenny press, of avoiding reasoned expositions of political principles.

The nineteenth century, however it may be condemned by later critics of the Victorian drama, painting, music and fiction, was, indeed, a period of revolution, and its changes in regard to journalism were such that, whereas, at the beginning of the century, a newspaper circulating two or three thousand copies a day was looked upon as phenomenally successful, by the end of the century, circulations rising to 250,000 or more daily were recorded of the penny newspapers, which had now become the dearer class; and much larger of the halfpenny press. There had also been a multiplication in the number of daily and weekly journals; and, in their supply of news, some of the best of the provincial papers rivalled the majority of those published in London. In the year 1800, so far as there is definite information,

barring the Irish capital, there were no daily journals published outside London, and the total number of news sheets was only about 250, as

compared with nearly 2500 at the present time. Today, the total of daily papers alone is over 240<sup>1</sup>.

In 1815, the number of newspapers in the United Kingdom was 252; but this was on the eve of an increase in the duties, and, subsequently, there was a fall. In 1824, it is stated<sup>2</sup>,

there were published in the United Kingdom, 266 papers in all... In the present year (1874) the aggregate number is 1585. Estimating the news sheets printed in 1824, we cannot place the number at more than 30 millions. In the present period, we do not doubt that the issue is 650 million sheets per annum.

In 1832, E. L. Bulwer Lytton (afterwards lord Lytton), in his famous speech advocating the abolition of the stamp, reckoned that every newspaper paid 1s. 4d. a sheet (a paper-maker's sheet) in paper-duty, 4d. in stamp-duty and 3s. 6d. for each advertisement, this being equal, with cost of printing and agency added, to 5½d. on a 7d. paper; so that but 1½d. was left for literary and other expenses, and for profits. To carry the figures a little further, it is said that, in 1782, there was published in the United Kingdom one newspaper to 110,000 inhabitants; in 1821, one to 90,000; and, in 1832, one to 55,000<sup>3</sup>. But the figures do not tell the whole story. There had been a complete revolution in the speed of printing. Prior to 1814, about two hundred impressions an hour could be obtained from one machine, and, if more than one machine were operated, for each was required a duplicate set of types. In 1814, John Walter, the second of that name who owned *The Times*, showed that, with the aid of steam, newspapers could be printed at the rate of 1100 copies per hour. Various improvements were made afterwards, greatly expediting the work. But, half-way in the century, papermakers made long rolls of paper, to run in a press fitted with cylinders on which were fixed, in the first instance, type, and, afterwards, cast metal plates reproducing pages of type; so that, by the end of the century, one cylindrical press could print, at the rate of 25,000 copies per hour, journals twice the size of those issued at the beginning of the century. Further, when a mould of a page of type has been taken, the printer can cast plates for about a dozen presses, each producing its 25,000 copies, and, by the application of photography to etching, it is possible to illustrate these rapidly produced journals. The substitution of mechanical type-setters,

<sup>1</sup> Sell's *Dictionary of the World's Press* for 1901.

<sup>2</sup> Francis, John C., *History of the Athenaeum*, vol. II, p. 326.

<sup>3</sup> Partington's *British Cyclopaedia of Arts, Sciences, etc.*, vol. III, p. 94.

and, more especially, the linotype, for hand composition, has greatly quickened and cheapened this department of production. Viewed from the mechanical standpoint, therefore, journalism shared to the full the inventive ability which marked the period, and to this is due, in part, its extraordinary growth.

The collection and presentation of news may be regarded as one of the applied arts—the application of literature to the recording of current, and often very transient, facts, providing, however, abundant material from which historians may reconstruct the life of the century. The student of Greek and Roman history must, of necessity, have recourse to such inscriptions as time and vandalism have failed to obliterate; from these, he endeavours to picture the actual conditions of peoples, their everyday work, their amusements, morality, hopes and fears. The journalism of the nineteenth century is a much ampler record of human activity in almost every direction, and this rapidly multiplied in volume as the century neared its close. Even advertisements are indicative of national life, its industries and amusements, educational and social institutions; often of religious or political and social thought. News embodied in today's journals is more detailed and plastic. The development of reporting, aided by railway transit, by telegraphy and, still later, by the telephone, has placed readers in almost immediate touch with the thought of the whole world; and any observant person who has seen the growth in size of the daily papers during the last quarter of the century, and of the increasing variety of their reports, ought to be able to trace many fresh paths of public activity, for example, the formation of societies, and the holding of meetings for the discussion of ideas upon every conceivable subject. Important, too, has been the discovery that paper could be made from wood pulp. But for this, it is certain there could have been no such multiplication of newspapers as the century saw.

The extension of British journalism has been the result, largely, of cheapness and of ability to obtain news in increasing quantity, and, in some respects, with greater accuracy—always with increasing speed. This was made possible only by a constant growth of revenue from advertisements. In the course of the century, shipping, manufacturing and finance were multiplied as if by some magician's wand, and, for daily information regarding them, men of all classes had resort to the newspaper press; the cost to individuals of obtaining such information for themselves being, in most instances, prohibitive. The

construction of railways, and even the invention of the motor-car, have revolutionised the means of placing newspapers in the hands of readers. The enterprise shown in distributing *The London Evening Courier* before the days of railways has been outdone<sup>1</sup>.

Politically, the century was highly favourable to the advance of the newspaper press. In its earlier years, the nation was exercised about the Napolconic war. Later came demands for the abolition of the corn-laws, catholic emancipation, popular education, the extension of the franchise, with a host of other political changes, often consequential upon what had gone before ; the Crimean war, the Indian mutiny, the expansion of the British empire, also did their part. The growing number of religious sects, of projects for social betterment, the multiplication of universities and of scientific and literary societies, new being added to old, partly as a result of the university extension movement, the growth of trade unions, the spread of concerts and of tours by dramatic companies, each of them advertising and requiring notices of its performances, the increasing work of representative local governing bodies, the planting of the schoolmaster in every little parish—these things have converted the newspaper press from a luxury into what seems to be a necessity of daily life. In Great Britain, it must further be noted, newspapers, for most of the century, have been unfettered by peculiar and restrictive legislation or censorship. In earlier years, this was not so. It was held illegal to publish the report of a criminal case heard before a magistrate, but not finally decided ; and verdicts for libel were given against newspapers on this account. Prosecutions at the instance of governments were numerous ; parliament often called editors and proprietors to its bar. The press, however, after not a little struggling, was able to assert a large degree of freedom, though it is noteworthy that, when the Newspaper society was founded, in May 1837, one of its chief concerns was the amendment of the law of libel, and that, seventy years later, the same subject was still under consideration.

One consequence of the increased mechanical rapidity of journalism in all its branches is the gradual disappearance, not of Bohemianism, but of alcoholism, among journalists. It is

<sup>1</sup> In Chas. A. Cooper's *Fifty Years of Newspaper Work*, it is related that, in 1865, *The Scotsman* of Edinburgh altered its system of sending parcels by railway with such effect that, whereas in February 1865, the circulation of the paper was 17,000 copies per day, in 1877, it had grown to 50,000.

impossible to imagine the occurrence, at the end of the century, of an incident like that detailed in James Grant's *Newspaper Press*, when the one reporter left on duty by his colleagues in the house of commons fabricated, for the benefit of an Irish colleague, a speech by Wilberforce, eulogising the virtues of the potato, with the result that the speech appeared in all the London newspapers except *The Morning Chronicle*, on which the practical joker himself was employed. Nor would it be possible for a famous editor to be intoxicated night after night, like the editor of *The Aurora*, depicted in William Jerdan's autobiography. Jerdan was a man of considerable pretensions to literature, and, in 1817, produced *The Literary Gazette*, the earliest weekly venture of the kind; for, though *The Examiner* made a feature of dramatic, and, to some extent, of literary, criticism, its main intention was political. Newspaper men have become as reputable and trustworthy as any workers in the nation. Proprietors and editors demand from their staffs unvarying fitness for duty; a Coleridge, working only when in the humour, could have little chance of employment. Nor would a brilliant but irregular Maginn (Thackeray's captain Shandon) be likely to edit a newspaper 'written by gentlemen for gentlemen,' or even one written, as sometimes seems to happen, by the ignorant for the ignorant. Journalism, moreover, has been yoked with the requirement of special knowledge of science, the arts and literature. Journalism, in short, passed through a revolution in the nineteenth century.

The business of providing the public with news has always been precarious; more so in London than in the provinces, though, even in the latter, there are many instances in which newspapers have sprung up, made a reputation and maintained it during many years, bringing wealth to their proprietors, and providing professional writers with what appeared to be permanent means of livelihood, and have then been overtaken by competitors, and, eventually, been extinguished. Still, there are, in different parts of the country, many which have run their course through the nineteenth century, and others which, though with altered titles, can show a similar continuity. In London, there are only three daily journals able to make such a boast. *The Morning Post* has had a continuous history since 1772; *The Times* was started by the first John Walter in 1785, as *The Daily Universal Register*, a title which, on 1 January 1788, gave place to *The Times*; and *The Morning Advertiser* was founded in 1794.

In this sketch of nineteenth-century English journalism, priority

may be given to *The Times* because, undoubtedly, during the greater part of the century, it was foremost among British newspapers; its fame in other countries far exceeded that of any of its contemporaries; it was the first newspaper to be printed by steam-power (29 November 1814); it was the first to send special correspondents—as Wotton said of ambassadors—‘to lie abroad’; it was the first to commission one of its staff, W. H. Russell, as a war correspondent; it was the first to print what is known as a parliamentary sketch or leading article; it was the latest to oppose the abolition of the stamp and paper duties, or to lower its price in the various stages through which other ventures showed the way, until, recently (1914), it has been compelled, by pressure of competition, to take its place among the penny morning papers; finally, until a few years into the twentieth century, it was mainly the property, and always under the active control, of the Walter family. Early in its career, it adopted the policy of enlisting among its contributors men of eminence in politics, in science, in literature, in the arts and in religion. During the greater part of its existence, the pecuniary profits of *The Times* were very large, and it could procure information by means too expensive for its contemporaries. Such was its position, that most people believed it to be beyond challenge by any rival<sup>1</sup>. The first John Walter was its first editor; he resigned his sceptre into the hands of the second John Walter in 1803. *The Times* had already achieved notoriety by certain libels, for some of which John Walter spent sixteen months in Newgate. His efforts to obtain news from the continent, and especially from France, brought the paper reputation among politicians and financiers; he was competing with the well-established *Morning Chronicle* under the editorship of James Perry, who had surrounded himself with a brilliant literary staff, and had effectively organised the reporting of parliament by relays of reporters who could produce their copy in time for publication in the next morning’s *Chronicle*. Perry’s method of organisation is still in force. John Walter the second learned by experience that the business of a proprietor interfered with editing, and he left much authority in the hands of members of his staff. Henry Crabb Robinson, sent out as foreign correspondent in 1807, was, in the next year, installed as foreign editor, and, some two years or so later, Dr (afterwards Sir) John Stoddart was appointed general editor. The British press, as a

<sup>1</sup> See, for instance, Andrews’s *A History of British Journalism* (1859), in the passage discussing the attitude of *The Times* towards the repeal of the stamp duty.

whole, was violent in attacking Napoleon, who, in 1802, pressed the British government to

adopt the most effectual measures to put a stop to the unbecoming and seditious publications with which the newspapers and writings printed in England are filled.

The government admitted that 'very improper paragraphs have lately appeared in some of the English newspapers against the Government of France'; but they repudiated responsibility, and suggested that the first consul might sue the newspapers in the English courts. There was a prosecution of a French newspaper published in London; but nothing came of it. *The Times* was among Napoleon's most coarse and violent assailants. Indeed, in 1817, John Walter, for this reason, removed Stoddart, installing Thomas Barnes, already on the staff of the paper—the first of two editors whose fame has never been excelled. When lord Melville had been dismissed from office in 1805, Peter Stuart, proprietor and editor of *The Oracle*—brother of the more famous Dan Stuart, of *The Morning Post*—defended Melville in an article reflecting severely upon the House of Commons. There were long debates in the chamber, and, in the course of them, the chancellor of the exchequer said,

It was almost the common fault of those connected with the press that they assumed a loftier tone, and perhaps gave themselves more importance, than naturally belonged to them<sup>1</sup>.

*The Times* has never been wanting in a sense of its own importance, and, whatever mistakes may have been made by it in the course of the nineteenth century, it has, throughout, been above suspicion of corruption. For the rest, *The Times* opposed the repeal of the corn-laws, until it was converted, not by argument, but by the magnitude of the demonstrations in Manchester and elsewhere, and by the wealth and local status of the men who took part in them. It opposed Stratford Canning's policy of maintaining the Turkish empire against Russian attack, until it saw that Palmerston, heading steadily for war with Russia, had the country at his back. Later, in the Russo-Turkish war of 1876, it still supported the Turks; but, towards the end of the century, as the attitude of important British politicians differed considerably, in this respect, from that of their predecessors, it turned to the

<sup>1</sup> As to the quarrel of *The Times* with Bright and Cobden in 1863, see Morley's *Life of Richard Cobden*, chap. xxxii, and R. H. Fox Bourne's *English Newspapers*, vol. II, pp. 188, 189.

opposite side. These changes need not have resulted from a desire to discover what the public wanted, and to satisfy the want; *The Times* was neither always lagging behind the views of those classes for which more particularly it was written, nor always anxious to see which way it ought to jump.

That *The Times* possessed enormous influence under Barnes and his successor (1841), John Thaddeus Delane, is indicated in all the political memoirs of the period. In the first number of *The Saturday Review* (3 November 1855), it was stated that one of the chief functions of the vigorous newcomer was to undermine this influence 'by the exercise of common-sense and ordinary perspicacity.' 'No apology,' it wrote, 'is necessary for assuming that this country is ruled by *The Times*. We all know it, or if we do not know it, we ought to know it.' In 1834, lord Althorp had written to Brougham, then lord chancellor, 'What I wanted to see you about is *The Times*; whether we are to make war on it, or come to terms.' By politicians, it was read, in its opposition days, for the slashing articles, first, of Peter Fraser, and, next, of captain Edward Sterling, father of John Sterling, the friend of Carlyle. Sterling is said to have put into lively and vigorous language ideas already floating in the minds of his readers. He gained for *The Times* the title 'The Thunderer', by writing, 'We thundered out the other day an article on social and political reform<sup>1</sup>'; and, of his writing, Wellington, in 1812, said 'Here is someone not afraid to write like a man.' Macaulay, as is recorded by Thomas Moore in his diary, contributed verses to *The Times* in 1831. Leigh Hunt, radical though he was, wrote literary reviews for it; Coleridge made advances to the second John Walter, proposing the impossible—that he should be appointed editor, with a perfectly free hand as to policy; George Borrow, while wandering in Spain, collecting materials for his famous book, acted as correspondent for *The Times*, and, writing with a freedom from the dignity which hedged in staff-writers of the great journal, became, it is said, a model for many who wrote for the cheaper newspapers. According to Escott, 'the young lions'—(Matthew Arnold's name for the writers on *The Daily Telegraph*)—owed much to Borrow, and one of captain Hamber's staff on *The Standard* 'had so steeped himself in Borrow's pure and easy phrasing that some of the disciple's *Letters from Corsica* were mistaken by experts for the Master's own.' But it is to Peter Fraser, a veritable man-about-town in behalf of his paper, that

<sup>1</sup> Escott's *Masters of English Journalism*, p. 175.



was attributed the influence won in the city of London by *The Times*, in the first quarter of the century. *The Times* always desired to feel the pulse not only of Westminster, but, also, of the city; it scarcely recognised public opinion in the manufacturing centres; hence, in part, at least, its opposition to all the great political evolutions of the century. Under Delane, *The Times* attained a larger cosmopolitan standing. It is said that Barnes furnished his coming successor with useful introductions, including one to Charles Greville of *The Memoirs*. Delane was, perhaps naturally, and certainly by training, more given to society than Barnes; he was not a writer in the same sense as his predecessor; at no time did he write much, and, in later years, he confined himself almost solely to receiving information which enabled him to direct or control other men. Disraeli had appeared in *The Times* with his *Runnymede Letters* (1836) and had won the friendship of Barnes<sup>1</sup>. He had some practical experience of newspaper work in behalf of his party, and formed notable conclusions upon the value of journalism<sup>2</sup>. Delane's advent was followed shortly by the defeat of the Melbourne administration, and much credit for this was taken by, and given to, *The Times*. Delane had a cross bench mind; though representing the conservative tendencies largely inherent in the professional and well-to-do classes, he was yet ready to criticise freely, not merely the government of the day, whatever its party complexion, but, also, a great mass of constitutional and social anomalies, thus paving the way for reforms. The famous letters by S. G. O. (lord Sidney Godolphin Osborne, who, twenty-five years after the appearance of his letters, read the service at Delane's funeral), were a rousing call for better conditions for the agricultural labourer. In 1839, *The Times* had opposed the duties on corn; but, apparently, John Walter was personally hostile to Sir Robert Peel, and *The Times* attacked both Peel and Sir James Graham. Especially was it against Peel's suggestion of a sliding scale of duties; but, to Bright and Cobden and the anti-Corn-law league, it was consistently adverse, though it assisted them grudgingly when opposition was seen to be useless.

A notable illustration of the way in which Delane picked up a policy is connected with the Crimean war. During the Aberdeen administration of 1852, the eastern question came to a head.

<sup>1</sup> See, *ante*, vol. xiii, chap. xi.

<sup>2</sup> It is certain that, at the time of his weekly newspaper, *The Press* (1853), he looked up to *The Times* articles as a model.

Thomas Chenery was then Constantinople correspondent of *The Times*, and reflected the opinions of Stratford Canning, the British ambassador. In September 1853, Delane wrote to Chenery, fiercely declaring it to be

impossible for you to continue to be our correspondent, if you persist in taking a line so diametrically opposed to the interests of this country.... You seem to imagine that England can desire nothing better than to sacrifice all its greatest interests, and its most cherished objects, to support barbarism against civilisation, the Moslem against the Christian, slavery against liberty, to exchange peace for war—all to oblige the Turk. Pray undeceive yourself.

Aberdeen drifted; Palmerston became the favourite of the classes for which *The Times* wrote; and Delane adopted the policy Chenery had been advocating.

During the war, *The Times*, by means of the letters written by W. H. Russell, its correspondent with the army in the Crimea, rendered signal service to the nation. There was then no press censorship, and Russell described freely conditions which brought needless suffering upon our troops. The facts gave rise to a loud outcry, and Florence Nightingale, assisted by 'S. G. O.,' and others, organised an adequate hospital system. *The Times* had now, undoubtedly, a commanding position, and its reputation was sustained in such a degree that when, in 1870, on the outbreak of the Franco-Prussian war, the general staffs of the two powers issued strict regulations for duly licensed war correspondents, all others being threatened as spies, there were, in this country, persons of repute for intelligence who wondered whether *The Times* would 'consent' to such a limitation of its enterprise. During the sixth, seventh and eighth decades of the nineteenth century, foreign statesmen looked much to *The Times* as indicating the probable policy of this country. Greville records that, in 1858, lord Derby asked him to see Delane, to dissuade him 'from writing any more irritating articles about France,' for these articles 'provoked the French to madness,' and lord Derby was concerned as to the consequences. Napoleon III, however, was quite ready to use *The Times* by sending it important information<sup>1</sup> without the knowledge of his ministers.

During the American civil war (1866), *The Times* again represented the majority of the professional and wealthy classes, in favouring the secessionists. Needless to say, it was not a

<sup>1</sup> Greville's *Memoirs* (third part), vol. 1, p. 119.

supporter of slavery, and it would not, in all cases, have advocated the right of a portion of a kingdom or a federation to separate from the remainder. Probably, the underlying sentiment was that the southern states embodied a continuance of the traditions surrounding ancestral homes and estate holding, while the north was associated with manufacturing and trade.

Delane supervised very carefully the articles by leader writers and correspondents, altering, or adding finishing touches; for instance, to a narrative of the Heenan and Sayers prize fight, he added, 'Restore the prize ring? As well re-establish the heptarchy.' The prize ring, in a modified form, has since been re-established. His caution was great. When, in 1875, Blowitz, of world fame in his day as Paris correspondent of *The Times*, sent word that Bismarck contemplated a fresh war with France, to prevent the latter from recovering her military strength, Delane held back the news for a fortnight—risking the grave possibility of being forestalled—while Chenery went to Paris, and obtained evidence fully confirming the report. This caution has been, not unnaturally, contrasted with the action of *The Times* in 1886, when the paper published the famous facsimile 'Parnell' letter, the forgery of which was afterwards confessed by Pigott.

John Walter the third had succeeded his father in 1847 when the paper contained normally about six times as much matter as *The Times* of 1803; and a large part of its prosperity was due to the forty-four years' management by the second John Walter. His successor was twenty-nine years of age, and on the eve of entering parliament as a liberal-conservative. Delane was firmly seated in the saddle, and, though the Walter family steadily turned to the conservative side, the paper continued more or less independent until the last years of Delane's editorship, when Disraeli's foreign policy, and, for the most part, his internal policy, had the support of the journal.

In the next period, *The Times* suffered from the competition of the penny press; and, at the very end of the century, from that of the halfpenny press also. Among its chief competitors were *The Daily Telegraph*, with its exuberant vitality, and the more steady-going, but more fashionable, *Morning Post*<sup>1</sup>.

Daniel Stuart bought *The Morning Post* in 1795, when its circulation was only 350 copies daily; in seven years, this rose to between 4000 and 4500—more than twice that of any other daily paper.

<sup>1</sup> Later changes in the proprietorship and control of *The Times* may not be noted here.

Stuart is sketched in Charles Lamb's *Newspapers Thirty-five Years Ago* :

'He ever appeared to us' writes Lamb 'one of the finest tempered of editors. Perry, of *The Morning Chronicle* was equally pleasant, with a dash, no slight one either, of the courtier. S. was frank, plain, and English all over.'

Lamb asserts that the 'sixpence a joke' which he received was thought high remuneration. Daniel Stuart and his brother Peter had already made their mark as printers and publishers. *The Morning Post* was whig in politics; the new proprietors turned it over to the tory side. James (afterwards Sir James) Mackintosh married the Stuarts' sister, and wrote much for them. Lamb was introduced to Daniel Stuart by Coleridge, to whose work De Quincey, writing of the newspaper press as a whole, pays a fine tribute—

Worlds of fine thinking lie buried in that vast abyss, never to be disinterred or restored to human admiration. Like the sea, it has swallowed treasures without end, that no diving bell will bring up again; but nowhere, throughout its shoreless magazines of wealth, does there lie such a bed of pearls, confounded with the rubbish and purgamenta of ages, as in the political papers of Coleridge. No more admirable monument could be raised to the memory of Coleridge than a republication of his essays in *The Morning Post*, but still more of those afterwards published in *The Courier*<sup>1</sup>.

He contributed to *The Morning Post* the famous satirical poem, *The Devil's Thoughts*. The connection was broken by his second tour in Germany and Italy, and it is said that, while he was abroad, Fox declared that his articles had led to the rupture of the truce of Amiens<sup>2</sup>. Most, if not all, of Coleridge's prose contributions to *The Morning Post* were reproduced in his *Essays on His Own Times*. In his absence, Southey wrote occasionally for *The Morning Post*, chiefly, if not wholly, verse; as also did Wordsworth, and Lamb's Birmingham friend, Lloyd.

*The Morning Post* represented an energetic foreign policy, and supported Palmerston in the Aberdeen ministry. Upon the formation of the Palmerston ministry, in 1855, Greville wrote :

<sup>1</sup> Most of them were republished. Coleridge's boast that, in one year, he raised the sale of the *Post* from a very low figure to 7000 copies daily, has led to much controversy; so, too, has the amount of work which he did. Stuart maintained that the rise in circulation was due to his own energy and the good reporting of news. Coleridge could scarcely have been other than erratic as a journalist; health, no less than mental characteristics, unfitted him for the daily effort which newspaper work entails. His claim as to the circulation of *The Morning Post* was examined carefully by Charles Wentworth Dilke—a most competent authority—who was of opinion that it could not be maintained. Coleridge was tried, among other things, at parliamentary reporting, apparently with indifferent success.

<sup>2</sup> See Coleridge's *Biographia Literaria*, and Andrews, vol. II, p. 29.

'Palmerston will soon find the whole press against him, except his own papers, *The Morning Post* and *The Morning Chronicle*, neither of which has any circulation or influence.' It is noteworthy, as bearing upon the curious question of the actual effect which newspaper writing may have upon national opinion, that, despite this overweighting of the press against him, Palmerston steadily advanced in popularity. *The Morning Post* came eventually into the hands of a Lancashire papermaker named Crompton, and, about 1850, Peter Borthwick, who had migrated from Scotland to London, obtained a position in the office as what his son, the late lord Glenesk, called *gérant*. He had already a position in politics and society, as M.P. for Evesham from 1835 to 1847, and was known favourably as a vigorous and resolute conservative speaker<sup>1</sup>. His only son Algernon was sent to Paris as correspondent. He

could speak French like a native, as well as write in it, not only all necessary prose, but some very passable verses, if some way after those written in the same language by another Paris correspondent, Frank Mahony ('Father Prout'), *The Globe's* representative on the Seine during later years of the same period.

On the death of Peter Borthwick, in 1852, his son took his place, and, it was said, 'afforded a fresh justification for the Caledonian boast that the London press was a Scottish creation, and that Flodden had avenged itself in Fleet Street.' With the help of Andrew Montagu—a Yorkshire millionaire related to his mother—Algernon Borthwick purchased *The Morning Post*. He attacked Palmerston for his ecclesiastical appointments—Palmerston's bishops being evangelical and Borthwick a high churchman; but, otherwise,

the polite world looked to the *Post*, not for news, but to see the whole mind of Palmerston, which often meant only the whole mind of Borthwick.... The briefs prepared by Palmerston to direct the manufacture of leaders often proved full enough, and finished enough, for wholesale production in the leader columns<sup>2</sup>.

A great friendship subsisted between Borthwick and count Walewski, French ambassador in the fifties; and there was a popular belief that Napoleon III subsidised the paper. Similar statements as to subsidies to other papers have been made with much greater probability: *The Morning Post* was not in pecuniary

<sup>1</sup> It is said that when some of his later speeches were received with suggestions that he had spoken at sufficient length, he told the house, 'If I am not allowed to conclude at my own time, and in my own way, I am determined not to conclude at all.' *Life of Peter Borthwick*, by Lucas, S.

<sup>2</sup> Escott, who states that he had his information from lord Glenesk.

difficulties. It was the last of the London papers in the century (1882) to reduce its price to one penny. Always maintaining its reputation as a record of the doings of the aristocratic and wealthy, and as an advocate of a forward foreign policy, *The Morning Post*, also, followed high ideals in its literary and artistic articles. It is said to have been the first London daily paper which, early in the century, printed regularly notices of plays, operas and concerts, and this feature has always been well maintained. Towards the end of the century, its articles on military topics, too, began to attract much attention. It was protectionist in the days of Peel, and in those of Chamberlain.

Of the morning papers in the first half of the century, *The Morning Chronicle* was, in many respects, the most famous. During several periods of its career, there were associated with it some most brilliant writers, and, even in its later stages, failure could not be attributed to lack of quality in the members of its staff. Any attempt to record the history of the newspaper press is confronted here, as in many other instances, with a problem all but insoluble—that of determining the actual causes of success or failure in journalistic effort. Often, the decisive cause would seem to be quality, but with a strangely inverted application. Sir Thomas Gresham, writing on the coinage, lays it down as a principle that, if you have in a country good coins and deteriorated coins of the same metal current side by side, the bad will drive out the good, and Gresham's law may often be applied to literature, to art and, especially, to journalism. The largest circulations have often been attained by newspapers not exhibiting the highest characteristics; indeed, newspapers have been known suddenly to reach enormous sales by publishing articles describing the careers of notorious criminals. The phrase 'survival of the fittest' must, therefore, be used 'with a difference.' *The Morning Chronicle* had belonged to William Woodfall, whose brother Sampson is famous for his publication of *The Letters of Junius*. Perry, editing *The Gazetteer*, competed so strongly with *The Chronicle*, that the latter came into the market, and, with the aid of the duke of Norfolk and others, Perry became its chief proprietor and editor. This was in 1789, when the whigs were in want of an organ, and *The Chronicle* filled the gap. Sheridan, Sir James Mackintosh, John Campbell (the future lord chancellor), Thomas Campbell the poet, Thomas Moore, David Ricardo, Henry (lord) Brougham, Albany Fonblanque and, as we have seen, Charles Lamb, were among those enlisted by Perry

or by John Black<sup>1</sup>, who, having been on the reporting staff of *The Chronicle*, became its joint editor in 1817, obtaining complete control in 1821, on Perry's death. Perry's writing had a lightness of touch unknown to his successor; but Black had higher qualifications for discussing public questions; Bentham called him the greatest publicist the country had seen, and among his favourite contributors were James and John Stuart Mill, the latter being only seventeen years of age when he contributed three letters condemning the punishment which Richard Carlile, his wife and her sister suffered for publishing unstamped papers. Black offended many of his whig friends by seeing good qualities in the duke of Wellington. His style was not free, but, according to John Stuart Mill, he was

the first journalist who carried criticism and the spirit of reform into the details of English institutions.... Black was a frequent visitor to my father, and Mr Grote used to say he always knew by the Monday morning's article whether Black had been with my father on the Sunday.

Black, in *The Chronicle*, was at war with *The Times*; as was no secret, one of his reporters, Charles Dickens, caricatured the quarrel<sup>2</sup>. Black regarded Dickens as the finest shorthand writer he had ever known—a judgment borne out by men who were colleagues of Dickens in the parliamentary gallery. Thackeray began his newspaper career as an art critic for the same paper. In the fifties, when the Peelites controlled *The Chronicle*, Palmerston inspired *The Morning Post*, and Greville, during the negotiations closing the Crimean war, said:

Palmerston continues to put articles into *The Morning Post*, full of arrogance and jactance, and calculated to raise obstacles to the peace. This is only what he did in '41, when he used to agree to certain things with his colleagues, and then put violent articles in *The Morning Chronicle* totally at variance with the views and resolutions of the Cabinet.

In 1862, *The Morning Chronicle* ended a notable career.

Daniel Stuart, in 1799, obtained possession of *The Courier*, an evening paper. To *The Courier*, in Stuart's hands, Wordsworth is said to have sent extracts from his then unpublished Cintra convention pamphlet, and, also, articles on the Spanish and Portuguese navies. Beginning with admiration for the French revolution, *The Courier* followed the popular lead in this country,

<sup>1</sup> Byron was a constant reader of *The Chronicle*; some of his *jeux d'esprit* were published in it, as also were the verses—the last he wrote—on his thirty-sixth birthday.

<sup>2</sup> See Escott, *Masters of Journalism*, p. 161.

and became an opponent of the French cause, and especially of Napoleon. In 1827, it supported Canning; William Mudford, the editor, author of a series of tales in *Blackwood's Magazine*, became a personal friend of this statesman. As a result, it was denounced by the ultra-tory party, and lost circulation, and, though, on the death of Canning, it reverted to toryism, there was no recovery of position. John Galt<sup>1</sup> edited it about 1830, and was followed by James Stuart, who, some years previously, having been libelled by Sir Alexander Boswell, son of James Boswell, had challenged him to a duel, and killed him. Stuart conducted *The Courier* as a whig paper, and, apparently, was the first editor of an evening paper to publish, once a week, an enlarged sheet with one entire page devoted to book reviews. In 1836, he was succeeded by Laman Blanchard. Shortly afterwards, however, the paper was again sold to the tories, and, with a new editor, lasted a few years longer.

*The Morning Herald*, first published in 1780, ran until 1869. It was founded by a somewhat notorious clergyman, Henry Bate Dudley, who had previously edited *The Morning Post*. It was not very successful until after 1820, when it received a large increase in circulation on account of its reporting of Bow street police cases, Wight, its reporter, afterwards editor and partner, exaggerating into caricatures his descriptions of the proceedings. So attractive was this feature that a selection from the reports was issued, with illustrations by George Cruikshank. An enterprising policy in regard to news raised the circulation, until, according to the official stamp returns for 1828, *The Morning Herald* had then a publication of 1000 copies daily above *The Times*. This position, however, was not maintained. In 1843, or 1844, Edwin Baldwin, a proprietor of *The Evening Standard*, purchased *The Morning Herald*, improved its literary quality, and, as it happened that the railway mania followed close upon his purchase of the paper, he was able to spend heavily. During the mania, the advertisement revenue of many newspapers was enormous. But the prosperity was not lasting, and, in a few years, Baldwin became bankrupt. James Johnson, an official in the court of bankruptcy, purchased *The Morning Herald* and *The Evening Standard*, and established *The Standard* as a penny morning paper. This was after the abolition of the newspaper advertisement duties, and when *The Daily Telegraph*, *The Daily News* and *The Morning Star* were being issued at a

<sup>1</sup> See, *ante*, vol. XII, chap. XI.



penny. Later, *The Herald* was discontinued; but, for many years, *The Standard* has occupied a high position in London journalism. It was a staunch supporter of the conservative party, and among its leader-writers numbered Alfred Austin, afterwards poet laureate. In conjunction with it, *The Evening Standard* was maintained, a paper with which was eventually amalgamated *The St James's Gazette*, an evening review and newspaper founded by Frederick Greenwood, one of the foremost journalists of the second half of the century, when a change in the ownership of *The Pall Mall Gazette* led to his retirement from that paper<sup>1</sup>.

The third morning paper which lasted through the century (after *The Morning Post* and *The Times*) is *The Morning Advertiser*, whose literary importance at no time equalled that of its two colleagues. It was first published in 1794 by the London society of licensed victuallers. Naturally, it was devoted to trade interests, rather than to the support of any one political party. Its circulation, however, fostered by the society, was, in the middle of the century, second only to that of *The Times*. *The Morning Advertiser* was one of the leaders in the attack upon the Prince Consort, which reflected widespread fears of non-constitutional interference in the management of public affairs<sup>2</sup>. Subsequently, the policy of the paper was changed.

Charles Dickens was not successful as a leader-writer, though he had been as a reporter. In 1845—6, there was a demand for a liberal paper which should be wide in its sympathies, looking towards the educational and industrial advancement of the masses, and treating religious questions from the point of view of those who 'faintly trust the larger hope.' Dissatisfied with the reception of an offer he made to write a series of sketches for *The Morning Chronicle*, Dickens talked over with his publishers the possibility of starting a rival newspaper, and, in the following year, agreed to edit *The Daily News*. Judged from the standpoint of the end of the century, Dickens's scheme of editing was much too solid and heavy. The paper contained his opening article, followed by three others, all dealing with corn-law reform; more than a page was occupied with a report of a meeting

<sup>1</sup> See *post*, p. 195.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Greville's *Memoirs* (third part, chap. v), on the subject of newspaper attacks on the prince. Somewhat later, Henry Dunckley, editor of the since defunct *Manchester Examiner and Times*, attained celebrity by a series of articles, afterwards (1878) republished under the title *Crown & Cabinet*, which he based largely, though not solely, upon the prince's position.

at Ipswich, and a speech there by Richard Cobden. A review of railway affairs and reports of railway company proceedings nearly filled another page<sup>1</sup>. After seventeen numbers had been issued, Dickens, as he said, 'tired to death, and quite worn out<sup>2</sup>,' ceased to edit the paper. John Forster took up the work, carrying it on to the end of the first year. It is said that, though all the proprietors were agreed in demanding the repeal of the corn-laws, there were great differences, not only among them, but, also, on the editorial staff, upon other questions, especially those bearing on foreign policy. Among its contributors, after 1852, was Miss Harriet Martineau—one of the two women who, in the century, attained especially high eminence as journalists, the other being Mrs Emily Crawford, later the Paris correspondent of *The Daily News* and of Henry Labouchere's *Truth*. *The Daily News* took its share in the campaign against the stamp duty, the tax on advertisements and the paper duty—the last being abolished in 1861. It had to cope with a Peelite endeavour to regain popularity for *The Morning Chronicle*, and was attacked in 1856 by the adherents of the then advanced radicalism of Cobden and Bright in *The Morning Star* and *The Evening Star*, which were started on 17 March 1856. *The Morning Star*, like *The Daily Telegraph*, which had now come into being, was sold at one penny. But the advanced radical paper was never able to attract the general public, and its attitude towards the Crimean war, no doubt, spoiled any chance of success which it might have had. On its staff, however, it numbered several distinguished men of letters and other journalists of subsequent high repute. *The Daily News* maintained an excellent reputation. After the opening of the Franco-Prussian war, in 1870, it was joined by Archibald Forbes. The ability of one man—though the subject of his articles, in this case, was of overwhelming interest—to give popularity to a newspaper was never exhibited more clearly; during the war, the circulation of *The Daily News* rose from 50,000 to 150,000 a day<sup>3</sup>. Writing in *The Nineteenth Century* of August 1891, Forbes indicated some of the dangers attending war correspondents during the time of his service. Referring to the Crimean and other campaigns before 1870, and recognising, generously, that W. H. Russell 'had made for himself a reputation to vie with which no representative of a newer school has any claim,' he

<sup>1</sup> See Fox Bourne, *English Newspapers*.

<sup>2</sup> See chapter on Dickens, vol. XIII, and of., as to Forster, *ante*, chap. II.

<sup>3</sup> Fox Bourne.

pointed out that the advent of the telegraph had increased the labour of the correspondent—as it has, indeed, in all departments of daily journalism—and that the older correspondents did not run the same risks as the later of being shot.

Before far-reaching rifle firearms came into use, it was quite easy to see a battle without getting within range of fire. With siege guns that carry shells ten miles, with field artillery having a range of four miles, and with rifles that kill without benefit of clergy at two miles, the war correspondent may as well stay at home with his mother, unless he has hardened his heart to take full share of the risks of the battlefield. In the petty Servian campaign of 1876, there were twelve correspondents who kept the field, and went under fire. Of those, three were killed, and four were wounded. Certainly not more than thirty correspondents and artists all told, were in the Soudan from the earliest troubles to the final failure of the Nile expedition, but on or under its cruel sand lie the corpses of at least six of my comrades.

Noteworthy among later contributors to *The Daily News* was Andrew Lang<sup>1</sup>.

Of those who took a leading part in the production of *The Daily Telegraph*, the first lord Burnham died while this chapter was passing through the press. To his constant care and unrivalled experience of affairs, the paper has owed much of its success. It was launched in 1855, and, in the course of a few months, passed into the hands of the Levi-Lawson family, who issued it as the first penny newspaper published in London. It was edited by Thornton Hunt, a son of Leigh Hunt, and early obtained celebrity for its enterprise and somewhat flamboyant style. Matthew Arnold scoffed at it; and a grandson of the first proprietor says that, when at Oxford, his tutor admonished him to 'try not to write like Sala.' To borrow a simile from the art of painting, the writers who gained reputation for *The Daily Telegraph* were, of choice, colourists. During many years, among the leading members of its staff was Sir Edwin Arnold, one of the brilliant Oxonians of the newspaper press, who is reported (by J. M. Le Sage) to have said that

whether the chief—whom we loved—asked him (Arnold) to write the first leading article, the description of some great historical event, or an ordinary news paragraph, he would do it to the utmost of his ability; that the test of loyalty was not to do some big thing, but some small thing—and to do it well.

The loyalty and affection here indicated, shared, as they were, by the whole staff, played a great part in making *The Daily Telegraph* so successful that, for some time before the advent of the halfpenny

<sup>1</sup> See, *ante*, chaps. II and III, and vol. XIII, chap. VI.

newspapers, it was able to boast that it possessed 'the largest circulation in the world.' The influence of the style of *The Daily Telegraph* upon the newspaper press of this country has been great; being, indeed, the basis of popular journalism. Not that the latter repeats the styles of Sala, of Edwin Arnold, of Edward Dicey, of Bennet Burleigh and of other men who long were looked upon as representing *The Daily Telegraph*; for, with features showing their influence has been combined a greater directness of statement; but the picturesqueness at which they aimed has had enduring effect. The loyalty of the staff accounted for the success of the paper in obtaining early information. Its enterprise has been shown in other directions. In 1873, George Smith was commissioned by it to make and describe archaeological exploration on the site of Nineveh, and among his discoveries were a number of fragments of the cuneiform narrative of the Deluge. Two years later, *The Daily Telegraph* joined *The New York Herald* in sending Henry M. Stanley into central Africa, where he surveyed lakes Victoria and Tanganyika, and traced the source of the Congo; later, for the same papers and *The Scotsman*, he was sent to rescue Emin pasha from Equatoria; but Emin refused to be rescued, and escaped from the rescue party. In 1884—5, it was associated with Sir Harry Johnston's exploration of Kilima-njaro, and, in 1899—1900, with Lionel Decle's journey from the Cape to Cairo. Its foreign staff have interviewed monarchs and statesmen; Bismarck, some time before the Franco-German war, confided to Beatty-Kingston that the military authorities had pressed him to quarrel with France—a course to which he was then opposed.

Its musical and dramatic criticisms by E. L. Blanchard, Joseph Bennett and Clement Scott were always read by the chief members of the professions affected.

Another morning newspaper established successfully during the century is *The Daily Chronicle*. Its founder, Edward Lloyd, was already the prosperous owner of *Lloyd's Weekly Newspaper*. In 1842, intending to compete with *The Illustrated London News*, he published *Lloyd's Illustrated London Newspaper*, unstamped. The authorities intervened, and, in 1843, he rearranged his publication without illustrations, calling it *Lloyd's Weekly London Newspaper*. In this form, it competed with other Sunday publications, such as *The News of the World*, *Reynolds's Weekly Newspaper*, *The Weekly Times*, *The Weekly Dispatch*. Of these papers, *The Dispatch* was long the most prominent. Its owner had been in

the front of the fight against the stamp duty; but *Lloyd's Weekly* soon became well established, especially under the short editorship of Douglas Jerrold from 1852 to 1857, and, thereafter, under that of his son Blanchard, who had among his coadjutors Hepworth Dixon, better known as editor of *The Athenaeum*, from 1853 to 1868.

In 1877, Edward Lloyd purchased a daily paper which had been started as *The Clerkenwell News*, but had expanded its name to *The London Daily Chronicle and Clerkenwell News*. He reduced the title to *The Daily Chronicle*, and adopted an independent radical policy. The venture prospered, and has latterly become one of the leading halfpenny morning papers.

The closing years of the century saw that advent of the halfpenny morning press to which reference has been made. There had been such papers in the provinces for thirty years, *The Northern Echo* being established in Darlington in 1869, *The North Star* in the same town in 1880 and, about the same time, *The Newcastle Express*, in the closing years of a long life, was published at the same price. But, though *The Northern Echo* achieved somewhat wide reputation in 1880, when it was edited by W. T. Stead, the issue of a halfpenny morning paper in London was a highly speculative undertaking. *The Daily Mail*, however, was launched in 1896, and proved most popular. Much of its earlier attractiveness was due to the writing of G. W. Steevens, who, after a brilliant career at Oxford, plunged into daily journalism, speedily became famous and died of fever in Ladysmith, where he was one of the besieged in the Boer war. *The Daily Express* made its appearance in 1900.

In the earlier part of the century, there were, in London, seven evening papers; at the end, only six, and the general development of evening journalism had not been commensurate with that of morning papers, having, for the most part, been limited to London and its suburbs, while morning journals were carried to all parts of the country. The change was owing chiefly to the growth of country evening papers, these being able by telegraph and organisation to print later information, notably concerning all forms of sport<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> The supply of news to a morning paper is usually complete by 2 a.m. and, thus, there is little actual need for late editions, but the news for an evening paper, the incidents of the day, comes in a continuous stream, its end being fixed only by the publication of the latest edition for which a sale can be had. The morning paper prints the news of twenty-four hours; the evening paper, as a rule, that of only eight.

Before *The Courier* was purchased by Daniel Stuart, it was joined, in the last number of *The Anti-Jacobin*, with *The Star* as forming a 'seditious evening post'; and, in 1792, at the instance of Pitt, *The Sun* was started to advocate the ministerial home and foreign policy. But it did not achieve a high position, and, in 1823, *The Edinburgh Review* said of it '*The Sun* appears daily but never shines.' *The Globe*, which, in the second half of the century, became tory, was, in its origin, radical, competing with *The Star*, the organ of the booksellers. Contemporary with *The Globe* was *The Traveller*, intended to support the interests of commercial travellers. A few years after its first publication, *The Traveller* became the property of Robert Torrens, an eager disciple of Jeremy Bentham, and a writer on political economy. Torrens and his friends purchased *The Globe* in 1823, and during many years the paper appeared with the double title. In all respects well conducted, it was recognised as one of the chief liberal organs, and the Melbourne administration of 1835 often used it for the first publication of ministerial news. It preserved its literary character, and, many years later, its sketchy serial and historical articles were widely known as '*Globe turnovers*,' their length always slightly exceeding a column. Francis Mahony, 'Father Prout,' was one of its regular contributors. In 1869, with new proprietors, it became moderately conservative, and, with varying fortune, so continued until after the end of the century. *The Pall Mall Gazette* obtained larger renown for its philosophic statesmanship. It was founded in 1865 by Frederick Greenwood, its proprietor being the wellknown publisher George Smith. The name was taken from Thackeray's sketch of captain Shandon in the *Marshalsea*, drawing up the prospectus of *The Pall Mall Gazette*—'written by gentlemen for gentlemen.' Greenwood turned the satire into reality. Under Thackeray, he had sub-edited *The Cornhill Magazine*, and his scheme contemplated the production of a paper which, with the publication of news, should combine some of the characteristics of the already flourishing *Saturday Review* and *Spectator*. Connected with the paper were men of mark in literature, such as (to mention men of very diverse qualifications) Anthony Trollope, Henry Maine, Fitz-james Stephen and E. C. Grenville Murray. On several occasions, Bismarck tried to form friendly relations with it. Greenwood, undoubtedly, was one of the great editors of the century, revising the work of his contributors, suggesting topics and their treatment and, with a masterly hand, adding finishing touches. His

sources of information gave him early news of the intention of the French government, in 1875, to obtain control over the Suez canal, by purchasing from the khedive of Egypt a large number of the shares held by him in that undertaking; and the fact was brought to the notice of Disraeli, the prime-minister, who forestalled the French. When, in 1881, the liberal party obtained a large majority in the house of commons, Henry Yates Thompson, a son-in-law of George Smith, had become proprietor of *The Pall Mall Gazette*, and, as he was a supporter of Gladstone, Frederick Greenwood and his colleagues were superseded by John (now viscount) Morley, who was installed as editor, with W. T. Stead, of *The Northern Echo*, as his chief of staff. Greenwood thereupon started the *St James's Gazette*, but could not acquire for it the vogue of his earlier paper. The career of W. T. Stead, who in 1883 followed Morley as editor, was remarkable. Brought up in a north country manse, and under the influence of fervent religious emotions, he believed that every step in his course was dictated directly from heaven. He assured the present writer that the Almighty set up finger-posts for him, whose intention was unmistakable, and that, on several occasions, when he had seen these directions, he had obeyed the command, apparently risking everything that most men hold precious. His efforts startling in their form, for the more stringent protection of girls, and the pride with which he suffered the consequences of his action, illustrate this attitude. He was, however, possessed of much humour, and was a most graphic correspondent. At the end of five years, another change of editor took place; and, later still, in 1892, *The Pall Mall Gazette* passed into a new proprietorship. At the same time, *The Westminster Gazette* was launched, which was conducted on much the same lines as those of the liberal *Pall Mall Gazette* had been, and, during several years, was the only London penny paper supporting the liberal party. One especial feature of *The Westminster Gazette* has been its brilliant political caricatures. Stead was drowned in the disaster to the 'Titanic.'

For many years, London had one halfpenny evening paper, *The Echo* (established 1868). Similar halfpenny papers were already in being at Manchester and Bolton in Lancashire. Later, *The Evening News* and *The Star* appeared.

Many as were the morning and evening papers published in London during the century, they were far outnumbered by weekly papers. Besides high-class and popular political weeklies, the

pictorial papers, from *The Illustrated London News*, *The Illustrated Times* (now extinct) and *The Graphic*, to those depending largely on the portraits of brides and bridegrooms, sportsmen and sports-women, actors, actresses and ladies of the ballet, the satirical and humorous papers from *Punch*<sup>1</sup> and *Fun* (now extinct) downwards, the century witnessed the establishment of scores of weekly newspapers, dealing with almost every description of specialised interest—religious, atheistic, scientific, mechanical, financial, military, naval, architectural, dramatic and artistic, a marvellous record of the mental activity of the nation. All these make their particular appeal, and even to indicate the character of each would be impossible in these pages. Some of them, indeed, however well their articles may be written, make no pretence of belonging to the domain of literature.

Why one newspaper succeeds and another fails, even the most experienced journalist will (as already hinted) hesitate to decide. *The Constitutional*, issued in 1836, had for its editor Laman Blanchard, with Thornton Hunt, afterwards editor of *The Daily Telegraph*, as his assistant. Thackeray's *Paris Sketch Book* is reminiscent of the fact that he was Paris correspondent for the paper, in which his step-father and he had unfortunately invested money; and among its constant contributors were Bulwer Lytton, Douglas Jerrold and Sir William Molesworth. It existed only seven months. Another was *The Hour*, issued in 1873 with captain Hamber as its editor. Hamber, who had been at Oriel college when lord Robert Cecil, afterwards third marquis of Salisbury, was also at Oxford, served in the Crimean war, and then turned to journalism. During several years, he edited *The Standard* with signal ability, but, eventually, quarrelled with its proprietor, who desired less independence of official conservative party control. Thereupon, *The Hour* was started as an ultra-protestant conservative paper, independent of the recognised party leaders. It never found a sufficient public, and, in 1876, Disraeli 'heard with a pang that *The Hour* was no more.'

A much more important publication was *The Press*, originated, in 1853, as a weekly representative of progressive conservatism, its first moving spirit being Disraeli, who, for some time, was a frequent contributor<sup>2</sup>. Its editor was Samuel Lucas (not the Samuel Lucas of *The Morning Star*) and the writers included Bulwer Lytton, George Smythe, Shirley Brooks, Tom Taylor,

<sup>1</sup> See, *post*, chap. VI.

<sup>2</sup> Cf., *ante*, vol. XIII, chap. XI.



lord Stanley, Sir J. E. Tennant, H. L. Mansel (afterwards dean of St Paul's) and Edward Vaughan Kenealy. Among later contributors were Richard Holt Hutton and Sir J. R. Seeley. It never obtained a circulation of more than 3500, and though, at its best period, it seems to have been financially stable, it ceased to exist in 1866.

Journalism has always allowed equality of literary opportunity to men and to women, to men who have made their mark at the universities and to those whose chief or only schooling has been such as they could pick up in the intervals of other occupations. Swift's judgment of Mrs Manley was that her writing, at times, was better than his own<sup>1</sup>. Defoe had an audience greater than that of Addison or Steele. In the early part of the nineteenth century. one of the self-educated had popularity and influence equal to those of any of his contemporaries. This was William Cobbett, born in 1762, of whom, and of whose *Political Register*, something has been said in a previous volume of this history<sup>2</sup>.

In 1808 appeared the first of a distinctive school of weekly periodicals, combining surveys of politics, literature, the drama and the pictorial arts, in articles intended more nearly to resemble a careful and a deliberate essay than the current comments of the daily newspaper. This was *The Examiner*, launched by John Hunt, and his more famous brother James Henry Leigh Hunt, of whose influence on English criticism and poetry an estimate will be found in an earlier volume of the present work<sup>3</sup>. In 1805, John Hunt issued *The News* and Leigh, then in his twenty-first year, was its theatrical critic. *The Examiner* followed. The dramatic criticism of *The News* had been free and independent, and attracted much attention. Writing of the kind was, according to Leigh Hunt's *Autobiography*, a great novelty. Similar independence in politics and literature marked *The Examiner*; and, not less for outspoken comments than for high quality of writing, it soon attained eminence. Before it was one year old, it came under prosecution for libel, but without result. In 1811, a scathing article on the prince regent—'a violator of his word... the companion of gamblers and demireps'—was followed by prosecution; and, though Brougham, as on a previous occasion, defended the brothers, they were fined £500 each with costs of about £1000, and sentenced to imprisonment for two years. Their confinement

<sup>1</sup> See letters to Esther Johnson and Rebecca Dingley. No. xxxii, 23 Oct. 1711.

<sup>2</sup> See, *ante*, vol. xi, pp. 49—51.

<sup>3</sup> *Ante*, vol. xii, pp. 220—4.

was not severe. Leigh Hunt had his wife and family with him, and visitors came every day—Charles and Mary Lamb, Hazlitt, Shelley, Barnes (later to edit *The Times*), Byron, Moore, Bentham and others. The popularity of *The Examiner* was not maintained; but, with varying fortunes, it continued in the hands of the Hunts until 1821, and, eventually, found a new and famous editor in Albany Fonblanque, a radical of the Benthamite school. Thus, during a quarter of a century, his paper was representative of the advanced group of politicians. John Forster followed him, and, later, Henry Morley, but the management and scheme of the paper were not modified to suit new conditions arising out of the competition of *The Spectator* and *The Saturday Review*, and, in the course of a few years, *The Examiner's* career ended.

In 1828, Joseph Hume and others raised money to enable Robert Stephen Rintoul to start *The Spectator* as an organ of 'educated radicalism.' It was, indeed, to perform for radicalism a service like that which Disraeli intended *The Press* to render to toryism, but, in the forefront, whether of educated radicalism, or of a liberalism not easily to be distinguished from independent conservatism, *The Spectator* has consistently held up the banner designed for it by its founder. Under Rintoul, it disputed the supremacy of Fonblanque's *Examiner* and led the advocacy of lord John Russell's franchise measure of 1831 by demanding 'the Bill, the whole Bill and nothing but the Bill'—a demand which *The Examiner* was obliged to echo, thus, in effect, acknowledging leadership.

In 1855, *The Saturday Review* made its appearance without the compendium of news which had formed a large portion of *The Spectator* and *The Examiner*, and the former of these, after the death of Rintoul in 1858, was remodelled in the hands of Meredith Townsend and Richard Holt Hutton. Until Gladstone adopted the Home Rule policy in 1885, *The Spectator* was his constant supporter; but its attitude towards the liberal party hereupon changed as to this and as to some other subjects.

According to their initial declaration, the Peelite projectors of *The Saturday Review*, as has been seen, wished to free thirty million people who were ruled despotically by *The Times*. Among early writers in *The Review* were Sir H. S. Maine, Sir James Fitzjames Stephen, W. Vernon Harcourt, E. A. Freeman, J. R. Green, Abraham Hayward, William Scott (an eminent Puseyite), Mrs Lynn Linton and lord Robert Cecil. The paper was noted

especially for the pungency of its satire, the brilliance of its style and the nicety of its scholarship. The political events of 1835 lost the liberal party not a few of its supporters in journalism, and, therefore, *The Speaker* was launched under the editorship of Sir T. Wemyss Reid, who had previously edited *The Leeds Mercury*. It was conducted with ability and existed a number of years without making headway in competition with *The Spectator* or *The Saturday Review*. Upon its discontinuance, *The Nation* appeared as an advocate of advanced liberalism. Other qualified successes in this form of journalism were Charles Mackay's *London Review*, in which Laurence Oliphant, Charles Isaac Elton and William Black, the novelist, participated in 1860, and *The Leader*, started, in 1849, with George Henry Lewes as principal writer and a staff including Herbert Spencer, Marian Evans, Alexander William Kinglake and Edward Michael Whitty—the last a peculiarly gifted writer of sketches of parliamentary celebrities.

Mention should be made of William Ernest Henley's effort to establish, in 1889, *The Scots Observer* as a literary review and an organ of imperialism, to be issued in Edinburgh, so that the Scottish capital might rival London in the possession of a weekly review, as it had done in quarterly reviewing and in daily journalism. Henley summoned to his colours the most famous Scottish writers of the day, but, in a couple of years, it was found necessary to transfer the paper to London, and to alter its title to *The National Observer*. Even so, unfortunately, it did not find room for permanent growth.

A position of its own was achieved by *The Economist*, which for seventeen years was under the editorship of Walter Bagehot, of whose great critical powers, primarily, but not exclusively, devoted to the elucidation of economical and political questions, something has been said elsewhere<sup>1</sup>.

Although *The Guardian*, primarily, was a religious weekly, being founded, in 1846, by a number of churchmen, including Gladstone, it gave much attention to political, social, and literary subjects, and among its constant contributors were men of high rank in their respective departments of knowledge. Until 1885, it was generally a supporter of the liberal party, but, thereafter, its political independence became more and more pronounced. It is impossible here to survey the wide field of religious periodicals, valuable though such a review would be as illustrating a gradual change

<sup>1</sup> See, *ante*, chapters I and III.

in the attitude towards religious journalism not only of the general public, but, also, of trained theologians of various schools. A mere catalogue of professedly religious papers might be misleading.

In specialised journalism, literature has always had a prominent place. In the first half of the eighteenth century, a weekly literary paper was founded entitled *The Grub Street Journal*, Alexander Pope being an early contributor. Its most notable successor, in the early part of the nineteenth century, was *The Literary Gazette*, established by William Jerdan, in 1817. George Crabbe, Mary Russell Mitford and Barry Cornwall wrote for it, and its career extended into the fifties. In 1828, it met an antagonist destined to win the first place—*The Athenaeum*. A full history of this long-lived literary paper has been written by the son of John Francis, who, at an early age, became associated with its business management. *The Athenaeum*, in 1830, was only struggling for existence when Charles Wentworth Dilke was placed in authority. The help given him by John Francis was of great value, but Dilke, in addition to being an enterprising proprietor, was, also, a man of letters, and, by his own writing, did much towards making secure the position of the paper. It would be impossible here to enumerate the nineteenth-century English writers who had more or less close connection with *The Athenaeum* and though, at various times, endeavours—such as those of *The Reader* and *The Academy*—have been made to depose it, these have not been attended with success.

Of journalism dealing with society in its many phases, much has been seen, not only in daily newspapers but, also, in specialised weekly publications. Of these, in the first half of the century, *John Bull*, which was also a political paper, became notorious, and was often threatened with prosecutions for libel, so much so that its chief conductors Theodore Hook, R. H. Barham, T. Haynes Bayley and James Smith (of *Rejected Addresses*) sheltered themselves in an anonymity which prosecutors were not able to penetrate. In more recent years, *The World*, founded by Edmund Yates and Henry Labouchere, and *Truth*, launched by the latter after some disagreement with Yates, became celebrated by their daring criticisms.

A brief notice must be added of the illustrated press, which is one of the distinctive growths of the century. Rough woodcuts, illustrating old chapbooks and thus appealing to the masses, attracted by representations of crimes, and other incidents narrated to them in literary form, were followed by work much

more artistic, but making appeal by means essentially the same. The adaptation of the art was possible, first, by improved mechanical production, and, later, by the application of photography, which, because of its ability to image an actual scene, has taken the place of the craftsman who, working from rapid notes, assisted by his power of imagination, contrived to represent not merely the facts, but, also, something of their meaning. The illustration of news pamphlets was common in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. In 1740, *The Daily Post* contained a narrative of admiral Vernon's attack on the Spaniards at Porto Bello illustrated with a view of the fleet, the fortifications, the harbour, the position of the Spanish fleet and the town; and *Owen's Weekly Chronicle*, in 1758, portrayed the British attack on Rochefort. These are said to be the earliest attempts in a newspaper to illustrate a news article<sup>1</sup>.

*The Observer*, a Sunday paper still in existence, was the first to adopt wood engraving after Bewick's development of the art; but, in 1806, *The Times* had an illustration, slightly influenced by Bewick's method, of Nelson's funeral car. *The Observer's* illustrations of the Cato street conspiracy in 1820, of the trial of queen Caroline in the same year and the coronation of George IV, of his visit to Ireland in the following year and of the famous murder of Weare by Thurtell, Probert and Hunt in 1823, were striking instances of ability to cater for a public on the look-out for sensational effect. *The Observer*, indeed, was a worthy forerunner of the cheap illustrated newspapers numerous at the end of the century.

*The Illustrated London News* was, however, a great leap forward. Among the thirty-two woodcuts of the first number was a view of the burning of Hamburg, apparently drawn from the inner Alster. Some of the character-sketches are as good as any published since, and far more distinctive than any photographic illustrations. Kenny Meadows, Birket Foster, John Leech, Sir John Gilbert, Alfred Crowquill and their colleagues, employed by Herbert Ingram, were associated with writers already known, and the paper soon attained a large circulation. It was followed by *The Pictorial Times* and this, again, by many others; but, chief among its surviving competitors are *The Graphic*, *The Queen*, *The Illustrated Sporting and Dramatic News*, *The Field*, *The Sphere*. *The Graphic* made a step in advance when it was supplemented by *The Daily Graphic*.

<sup>1</sup> *The Pictorial Press* (1885), by Mason Jackson.

We have noted several praiseworthy, but unsuccessful, attempts to found journals, and, although this narrative deals mainly with the nineteenth century, we may add references to two which fall in the twentieth. One was the issue of *The Pilot*, partly in competition with *The Guardian*. The literary quality and variety of interest in the articles of *The Pilot* deserved a success which was not attained. The difficulties in the way of fighting a well-established periodical are very great, a newcomer having to incur expenses practically equalling those of the periodical with which it competes, while its advertising revenue is, necessarily, very small in comparison; and it often happens that the strain involved in such conditions is greater than the projectors are able or willing to bear. A similar comment may be made upon the fate of *The Tribune*, intended, by its projector, to take a position at the head of liberal journalism. The intention was admirable; and, from a purely literary point of view, many were the regrets when it was learnt that the paper was a financial failure.

If the history of the newspaper press of the 'provinces' could be traced in detail, it would be found, in the main, the vehicle of opinion entirely independent of that expressed in London, admitting the leadership of the London press as little as other members in parliament would allow it to those sitting for London constituencies. The 'provincial' press has, indeed, been much more free than the London press from the influence of political organisers. It has been read by weavers and shoemakers no less than by employers of labour and professional men<sup>1</sup>. No doubt, newspapers printed in London have always had a wider circulation in the provinces than country newspapers have had in London. One of the prosecutions which Cobbett and the Hunts underwent was for reprinting an article written for and published in *The Stamford News*; and, though London has exercised an attraction for newspaper writers because of the greater variety of opportunities which it offers them, many newspapers published out of London have been as well written and edited, as careful and, within limits, as enterprising in the collection of news, and as skilled in the arrangement of material, as any London journal. Several of the country newspapers existing at the end of the nineteenth century could boast a career longer than that of any London paper, though many have disappeared, and some, in the course of a long life, have lost the importance which, as compared with rivals, they once possessed.

<sup>1</sup> See Bamford's *Passages in the Life of a Radical* (1840—4).

There were country papers in the early part of the eighteenth century ; and, though they copied from their London contemporaries much of their general and foreign news, they printed information peculiar to the districts in which they circulated. The 'provincial' press has attracted men of ability. *The Sheffield Iris* had, as editor, James Montgomery the poet ; Hugh Miller, the geologist, edited *The Edinburgh Witness* ; James Hannay, *The Edinburgh Courant* ; William Henry Ireland was editor of *The York Herald* when, in 1823, Sydney Smith sent to it for publication the manuscript of his earliest political speech, that at the Three Tuns in Thirsk. That Sydney Smith and his friends should want their speeches to be published in this way, indicates the importance of the country press at the time<sup>1</sup>. John Mackay Wilson, author of *Tales of the Borders*, edited *The Berwick Advertiser* ; William Etty, the painter, was a compositor on *The Hull Packet* ; De Quincey, during a part of his residence in the lake district, walked once a week into Kendal to edit *The Westmorland Gazette* and see his leading article printed ; Alexander Russel, of *The Scotsman*, was as influential and as independent as any writer in the United Kingdom. These men flourished in days when, according to some writers, the provincial press was a weak reflex of opinions published in London—a statement which would be entirely ridiculous if applied to the latter half of the nineteenth century, when the extended use of the telegraph had made it possible for the provincial newspapers to receive simultaneously with the London press reports of important occurrences and speeches, and to comment upon them the same night. Indeed, there have been occasions when complaints were made in behalf of an eminent statesman that, though he spoke in London, the provincial newspapers could print his speech and leading articles upon it, while his supporters in the London press could not do more than print his speech—commenting on it the following day. As in London, so in the country, the removal of taxes upon paper, newspapers and advertisements gave a great impetus to journalism, many papers being started, and not a few of the weeklies being converted into dailies. Space will not permit a sketch of these, valuable though it would be, if not, indeed, essential, in any complete narrative of the industrial, social and educational development of the country. Mention, however, must be made of *The Manchester Guardian*, because, at the end of the century, through a variety of causes, it became the chief morning

<sup>1</sup> See G. W. E. Russell's *Sydney Smith*, p. 109.

exponent of liberal policy in the United Kingdom, and because, during many years, there were associated with it writers of the highest rank in special subjects. It is remarkable that these qualities did not, in any way, lessen its experience of the keen competition set up by less expensive journalism. Manchester had been the scene of the first endeavour to issue a daily paper in the provinces. This was in 1811<sup>1</sup>. Another journal issued outside London should, also, be mentioned because of its metropolitan character. *The Scotsman* was founded in Edinburgh in 1817, to promote reasoned liberal opinions. It developed into a daily paper, and, in the hands of Alexander Russel, achieved a wide and sound reputation. Its support was wholly given to the liberal party until 1885.

The halfpenny evening papers of the biggest centres in the provinces and Scotland are better arranged than those of London. Like the chief morning papers, they are connected with London by private telegraph wires, and it would be impossible for any London evening newspaper to obtain, within their areas, a circulation of more than a few dozen copies, bought for some especial feature.

The tendency of journalism towards the end of the century was not of the kind anticipated by writers and thinkers of the middle period. It depended more and more upon advertisements; in many cases, the cost of procuring news and articles, and printing and publishing them, is materially greater than the prices charged for the newspapers; and those with very large circulations are not always noted for careful ascertainment of facts or for deliberation in their political judgments.

The journalist has no title to usurp the functions of prophet, and, therefore, no attempt is made here to look into the future. The great dependence of newspaper properties upon advertisements may or may not subject them to a rude shock, or, as a result of a reorganisation of industrial conditions, to a gradual loss of revenue. In either case, no doubt, the contraction of their activities in the matter of the very expensive collection of news would be probable, since a growth in circulation cannot compensate for the shrinkage of advertisements. Our task has been to record the past of English journalism, and this, as we have endeavoured to show, has been at least in harmony with the general development in arts and science, and in the industrial, social and political conditions of the country.

<sup>1</sup> Andrews's *History of British Journalism*, vol. II, p. 124.



## CHAPTER V

### UNIVERSITY JOURNALISM

THE man in the train has settled habits and views, definite experience of life, its problems and difficulties. The undergraduate changes yearly, and is in the tentative period of youth, though the influence of his school and his restricted atmosphere (in England, at any rate) keep him fairly constant in type. He has much of the freedom of manhood without its responsibilities. For him, life is a comedy, or, at most, a tragi-comedy; he has not begun to understand. He writes, if he writes at all, at leisure, and the product of idle hours beneath the shade, as Horace hints, is not often destined to be remembered beyond the year. Horace, who owed his success largely to a good schoolmaster and the university of Athens, is, in tone and form, the ideal poet of university life. He is half-serious, half-sportive, with an exquisite sense of form and metre, and he has more university imitators than a dozen good prose writers can boast. These imitators have a zeal for form due to their reading. The study of the ancient classics gives a sense of conciseness, and a detestation for the mere verbiage which is frequent in ordinary journalism. University journalism thus follows a great tradition, but it does not start a new one.

An anarchic age like the present is inclined to underrate the sense of tradition, which does not, perhaps, foster the most seminal minds; but modern masters of prose and verse have mostly been trained in it, and the maxim, 'the form, the form alone is eloquent,' is worth remembering. In particular, the sense of comedy which comes from playing at life has found expression in classical parody and light verse. Here, Cambridge can show a long line of masters whom she has trained, from Prior and Praed to Thackeray, Calverley and J. K. Stephen. Oxford, more in touch with the world, has been more serious and more prolific

in prophets, but can claim a first-rate professor of the sportive mood in Andrew Lang. Calverley, however, is the leading master and his inimitable short line has had many disciples:

The wit of smooth delicious Matthew Prior,  
The rhythmic grace which Hookham Frere displayed,  
The summer lightning wreathing Byron's lyre,  
The neat inevitable turns of Praed,  
Rhymes to which Hudibras could scarce aspire,  
Such metric pranks as Gilbert oft has played,  
All these good gifts and others far sublimer  
Are found in thee, beloved Cambridge rhymers<sup>1</sup>.

Among many excellent composers of parody in verse, A. C. Hilton is pre-eminent. The two numbers of *The Light Green*, which are mainly his work, were produced just before and after he took his degree at Cambridge (1872), and are still sold in reprints. They represent a solitary flowering of wit and craftsmanship, for he died young. *The Light Green* ridiculed *The Dark Blue*, a magazine now forgotten, which was published in London, but was understood to represent the life and thought of young Oxford<sup>2</sup>. Hilton's supreme achievement is a parody of Bret Harte's *Heathen Chinee*. *The Heathen Pass-ee* secretes about his person tips for examination purposes instead of the cards of his prototype:

On the cuff of his shirt  
He had managed to get  
What we hoped had been dirt,  
But which proved, I regret,  
To be notes on the rise of the Drama,  
A question invariably set.  
. . . . .  
In the crown of his cap  
Were the Furies and Fates,  
And a delicate map  
Of the Dorian States,  
And we found in his palms which were hollow,  
What are frequent in palms,—that is dates.

The last two lines are perfect in point, expression and likeness to the original. Almost equally famous are *The Vulture and the Husbandman*, after Lewis Carroll, and *The Octopus*, after Swinburne.

Special brilliance is certainly needed to make university

<sup>1</sup> J. K. S., *Lapsus Calami*, 'To C. S. C.' See, *ante*, vol. XIII, chap. VI.

<sup>2</sup> Russell, G. W. E., *Collections and Recollections*, chap. XXVIII.

magazines live; their humour is limited in scope, and refers to persons who do not survive in the public memory; jests pass with many repetitions from Oxford to Cambridge and back again, and even to America, where an old story of Whewell is now current concerning a new professor of encyclopaedic range. Hence, a great number of university magazines are forgotten, and a study of them at large does not suggest that they deserved to be more than ephemeral. *The Shotover Papers, or Echoes of Oxford* (1874—5) may serve as a typical example of parodies and comments which, praised in their day, have now lost their savour. In such magazines, the social history and atmosphere of the university are fairly recorded for the future historian; but the Promethean touch which lifts the local to the permanent is wanting. Great men, however, will always attract great attention even by their immature efforts. Thus, *The Snob* and *The Gownsmen* are still remembered because they contained the work of Thackeray; but they were not brilliant periodicals; and comic treatments, by comparatively unknown persons, of subjects set for prize poems are quite as good as Thackeray's *Timbuctoo*.

The credit of having been the first lasting university organ belongs to *The Cambridge Review*, which was started in 1879, and has been published weekly in term time ever since. The first number expresses the idea that university men are too busy to have much time for journalism; but the purpose of the *Review*—to give a representation of the life and thought of the university—has been well maintained. It has a semi-official claim, too, on serious readers, in publishing weekly the university sermon. Perpetual discussions of university topics which, to the outsider, seem of small moment is characteristic of all universities; learned and sedentary persons are prone to controversy; and, perhaps, for this reason, the *Review* has not paid so much attention to *belles lettres* as some of its light-hearted predecessors. It has, however, had its humours, as the selections in *The Book of the Cambridge Review* (1898) show, and, for many years, it has excelled every February in valentines, ingenious quotations and perversions of quotations, addressed to men of note both in and outside Cambridge.

In the nineties, *The Granta* started as a light and bright commentator on Cambridge affairs, and absorbed some of the humour which would otherwise have found a place in the *Review*. The wayward genius of J. K. Stephen, already an accomplished rimer in his Eton days, shone in both periodicals. His verse is the more

astonishing inasmuch as it was casually and rapidly produced. His best known lines (*The Cambridge Review*, 1891),

When the Rudyards cease from kipling  
And the Haggards Ride no more<sup>1</sup>,

have become so familiar that their author is often forgotten.

Of other Cambridge periodicals, the best are *The Cambridge University Magazine*, which came out under the title *The Symposium* in 1840, and contained some good work by George Brimley, and *The Tatler in Cambridge* (1871—2) which was illumined by the wit of A. W. Verrall. *The Cambridge Observer* was started in 1892 by a small group including G. W. Steevens, an Oxford man then in Cambridge, S. V. Makower and others. Largely ignoring the ancient classics, it set out *épater le bourgeois*, and was defiantly propagandist concerning foreign authors. It contested the claim of contemporary critics, and discovered the best of all art in the New English Art club. Such a paper could not last, but did something, in spite of its extravagancies, to enlarge the average mind of the university.

*The Oxford Magazine*, which was started in 1883, has lasted till today, and secured a recognised position as a commentator on university affairs. Resembling *The Cambridge Review* in general, it differs in being the organ of the don. The talent for writing English is more widely valued at Oxford than at Cambridge; essays figure largely in examinations; and the Oxford paper is more elaborately written than its contemporary. It is, in fact, almost too well written, and loses, sometimes, in irony and paraphrase what it would have gained by naturalness. It has that excessive use of negative forms of expression which is characteristic of Jane Austen and it has maintained an excellent standard of serious verse. The pieces in *Echoes from the Oxford Magazine: being reprints of Seven Years* (1890) form a collection unrivalled for brilliancy. R. W. Raper is supreme in his parody of Whitman. The volume is also strong in that humour which comes from imitating in English the style and manner of an ancient author. 'L'Envoy,' concerning the purpose of *The Magazine*, is a good specimen of Oxford prose.

As *The Cambridge Review* was supplemented by *The Granta*, *The Isis* was started in 1892 as a light-hearted and flippant variant on the sobriety of *The Oxford Magazine*. A prominent feature in the paper is the series of 'Isis Idols' with illustrations.

Of other Oxford magazines of the nineteenth century, *The*

<sup>1</sup> J. K. S., *Lapsus Calami*, 'To R. K.' See, *ante*, vol. XIII, chap. VI.

*Oxford Critic and University Magazine* (1857), conducted chiefly by undergraduates, was the first to shake off the lumbering verbosity which came from Johnson and survived longer in the universities than elsewhere. Its criticism was occasionally smart, but its verse lacked distinction. *The Oxford Spectator* of Copleston and Nolan (1868), in shape and size like Addison's famous periodical, is still remembered as a deserved success. It was humorous on esoteric subjects like Oxford philosophy, but, also, was capable of seizing the charm of Oxford in such a passage as this:

When I look back to my own experience, I find one scene, of all Oxford, most deeply engraved upon 'the mindful tablets of my soul.' And yet not a scene, but a fairy compound of smell and sound, and sight and thought. The wonderful scent of the meadow air just above Ifley, on a hot May evening, and the gay colours of twenty boats along the shore, the poles all stretched out from the bank to set the boats clear, and the sonorous cries of 'ten seconds more,' all down from the green barge to the lasher. And yet that unrivalled moment is only typical of all the term; the various elements of beauty and pleasure are concentrated there.

The conditions of academic life in Scotland differ considerably from those prevailing in Oxford and Cambridge, and the resultant journalism does not make so general an appeal as the best of the English writing of the sort. The Scots tongue, in spite of its unqualified successes with most English readers, is not known or liked by all, and the same may be said of Scots humour, which is apt to be grim, and of Scots metaphysics. Apart from these differences of language, the Scots student has not the full advantage of the corporate life from which it is difficult for the Oxford or Cambridge undergraduate to differentiate himself. The first magazine proper of Aberdeen, *The King's College Miscellany* (1846), printed mathematical and physical problems with solutions, and translations from Greek and Latin authors. *Alma Mater*, also of Aberdeen, is the oldest of the existing Scots university periodicals, starting in 1883. It is thus six years senior to *The St Andrews College Echoes*, and *The Glasgow University Magazine* of 1889, and four to the *Edinburgh Student*. During the first half of the century, Aberdeen was a desert so far as literature is concerned, and it was the vivid interest of Minto that suggested to his students the idea of *Alma Mater*. It has done much to bring together the diverse elements of the university, and, from time to time, has had excellent plates. It has also done much in the way of academic history and reminiscence, which, previously, had been less cultivated here than in England. St Andrews claims a light poet and parodist of distinction in R. F. Murray, the

author of *The Scarlet Gown* (1891). Andrew Lang, indeed, might have been one of the glories of St Andrews journalism; but the weekly magazine which he helped to found never reached the dignity of print.

*The University Maga* is the happiest of early efforts in Edinburgh academic journalism. It ran for twenty-four weekly numbers in 1835 and 1837—8. Edward Forbes was mainly responsible for it, and contributed some good verses and a number of excellent caricatures and sketches. It was altogether a lively production, and reflects the spirit of the times better than its fellows. It was not until 1887 that it was possible to establish a university journal with a reasonable chance of permanence, and this can be easily understood in an intensely independent and individualistic society with no common meeting-place and practically no sport. The students' representative council improved matters, and *The Student* was started in 1887 as a private venture with the idea that the council would, in time, assume the responsibility of financing it. This happened in 1889, and, since then, *The Student* has appeared weekly, and become a recognised university institution.

The university of Edinburgh includes among its academic writers R. L. Stevenson. The essay entitled 'A College Magazine' in *Memories and Portraits* describes the brief fortunes of *The Edinburgh University Magazine* (the fourth of the name), which, with three collaborators, he edited, and which perished after four numbers.

The magazine appeared, in a yellow cover which was the best part of it, for at least it was unassuming; it ran four months in undisturbed obscurity, and died without a gasp. The first number was edited by all four of us with prodigious bustle; the second fell principally into the hands of Ferrier and me; the third I edited alone; and it has long been a solemn question who it was that edited the fourth.

As a matter of fact, the literary standard of the magazine was high, and Lord Neaves made some excellent contributions to it.

The paper by Stevenson reprinted in *Memories and Portraits*, 'An Old Scotch Gardener,' even after allowance for mature correction, must be regarded as an excellent character-study. But the people of Edinburgh, academic or unacademic, could hardly be credited with sufficient self-detachment to see special points in a type of character long familiar in Scots life. And character-studies are mature work, needing a mature audience, not the faulty judgment of the young college man who worships only

success and brains. Stevenson speaks, in the former essay, of 'young gentlemen from the universities' who 'are encouraged, at so much a line, to garble facts, insult foreign nations and calumniate private individuals.' It is a great merit of academic journalism that these things are not done in the universities themselves. To calumniate is dangerous in view of the law of libel; but the increasing zeal for personal gossip, trivial when it is not unpleasant, has taken little hold on university journalism. The free use of slang, preferably of American origin, and excessive attention to public entertainers are, further, not characteristic of such periodicals, and, in this respect, universities may do well in being behind the general movement of the press.

Irishmen have a way of being brilliant, and Trinity college, Dublin, has had a galaxy of talent for its academic ventures in journalism. *The Dublin University Review*, which started in 1885, was really good during its short career. Collectors now give high prices for single copies of this *Magazine of Literature, Art and University Intelligence*. The magazine had a wider scope than English periodicals of the sort, finding room for the strongly divergent views of Irish politicians. It was a pioneer, too, in including poetry in the original Irish (probably the first specimens of Irish type seen in a modern review).

The oddly named *Kottabos* is, however, perhaps the cream of Irish academic wit and scholarship. It appeared three times a year and was started by R. Y. Tyrrell in 1868, running for thirteen years. Its fortunes and revival after an interval from 1888 to 1895 are recorded in *Echoes from Kottabos*<sup>1</sup> (1906). Tyrrell was a brilliant classical scholar with an extraordinary memory and an incisive wit, and his magazine excelled in light verse, translations and imitations (reverent and burlesque) of poets ancient and modern, from Aeschylus to Kipling. The contributors included Edward Dowden, John Todhunter, Oscar Wilde and Standish O'Grady. *Kottabos* is more definitely classical than most magazines of the sort, and some of its exercises passed into *Dublin Translations into Greek and Latin Verse*, a form of journalism, perhaps, too learned to gain general recognition. Still, it may be remembered that, without distinction in Latin verse translation, Addison might never have had the chance to establish the periodical essay, or Prior the school of light verse which is the chief distinction of university writing.

<sup>1</sup> *κότταβος*, a game in vogue at Athens depending on the skilful throwing of wine from a cup.

## CHAPTER VI

### CARICATURE AND THE LITERATURE OF SPORT

#### *PUNCH*

THE literature to be described in this chapter owes so much, in origin and in development, to pictorial art, that the subject demands a brief preliminary account of the growth of engraving, and especially of caricature, in England. Caricature, in the sense of pictorial comment on contemporary political or social conditions, was not unknown in the reign of James II. William III brought with him from Holland Dutch artists, among them de Hooghe, who produced work of this nature; and their presence spurred on native artists. In the reign of Anne, caricature was frequent. A print of 1710 shows Sacheverell taking counsel of the devil and a Roman catholic priest; and Sacheverell often appeared in political plates. The famous pamphlet ascribed by Swift to Arbuthnot, *Law is a Bottomless Pit* or *The History of John Bull* (1712), was a fertile source of figures for draughtsmen. If this pamphlet did not originate the impersonation of England as 'John Bull,' it made it popular; while the appearance of Louis XIV as 'Lewis Baboon,' of Holland as 'Nick Frog,' of Charles of Spain as 'The Lord Strutt,' of the English parliament as 'Mrs Bull,' and so forth, provided political draughtsmen with ideas of the kind that they needed. Now, as later, Tories freely used this weapon against Whigs. The South Sea Bubble, in the year 1720, gave a strong impetus to English caricature. Pine, Bickham and Picart were among the many artists who produced plates on the subject; but more important than any was the work of Hogarth. After the time of the South Sea Bubble, caricatures became more and more popular; to some extent, they took the place of the political pamphlets which had been common in the previous century<sup>1</sup>. Gravelot, in 1727, made an engraving which appears to have been the first attack of this kind on the prevalent corruption at parliamentary elections;

<sup>1</sup> See, *ante*, vol. VII, chap. XVI.



and he was one of many caricaturists who found a fruitful subject in Walpole and his whig government. The caricatures of the day were not all political. Social conditions were freely criticised; many of the plates being grossly improper and many very ill-drawn. The designing of these pictorial jests or attacks became something like fashionable: amateurs indulged in it, such as the countess of Burlington and George Townshend. Pope was a favourite subject, and lord Bute was frequently attacked for his patronage of the Scots; while one of the best known prints is the caricature of Handel as a pig playing the organ, by Goupy, drawing-master to George III.

Setting aside his artistic greatness, the service which Hogarth rendered to caricature was twofold. On the one hand, he showed that both political and social subjects could be treated forcibly without deliberate grossness. To modern taste, a good deal of Hogarth appears coarse: comparison of his work at its coarsest with plates by the common run of unknown or little known artists of the early part of the eighteenth century will show him by contrast refined. The social satirist must needs handle foul matter; but Hogarth never, like some of his contemporaries, indulges in grossness for its own sake, nor appears to enjoy it. Henry Fielding's tribute to Hogarth's work in the introduction to *Joseph Andrews* raised the estimation of caricature to a higher position than it had yet occupied; and if, later (in their treatment, for instance, of lady Hamilton and Nelson), English caricaturists forgot what they had learned from Hogarth, his influence was never wholly lost. Pictorial art, following the example of literature from Defoe, through *The Spectator*, to Fielding, turned with interest to the common life around itself. Hogarth found a various and strong-featured world to his hand. The life of fashionable people, Heidegger's masquerades, the Italian opera, Rich and his pantomimes, plays representing 'low life'—in the two famous *Progresses* and in many other plates these subjects are recorded for us without the grotesque exaggeration which was frequent among caricaturists of his day. In *Gin Lane*, *Beer Street*, *The Enraged Musician* and other plates we have the London life that was under the artist's eyes preserved for our own; and in such plates as *England*, *France* and *Calais Gate* may be found that feeling of 'John Bull' towards the Frenchman which was apparent in Smollett's *Travels through France and Italy*, and was to become a prominent element of the literature and life of England till long after the fall of Napoleon. To Hogarth's choice

of subject and to his treatment of what subjects he chose, English literature owed a considerable debt.

The second benefit which Hogarth conferred upon pictorial illustration and caricature lay on the commercial side of the artist's work. With George Vertue and others, he was instrumental in obtaining from parliament an act to vest in the designer the exclusive copyright in his own works. This bill received the royal assent in 1735, just before the publication of *The Rake's Progress*, and was destined to have important effects upon the commerce of engraving a few years later. Meanwhile, among those who were to benefit immediately were the caricaturists of the middle period of the eighteenth century: John Collett, S. H. Grimm, Bickham, Bampfylde, captain Minshull and captain Topham (two half-amateur artists whose designs were usually engraved by others), besides certain French artists working in London. About this time, too, the political magazine found its way to favour, and a number of artists supplied these magazines with caricatures, which were usually signed with pseudonyms. Eminent names in the latter half of the eighteenth century were Sayer and Darley. Sayer was a poor draughtsman, but an efficient caricaturist. In the pay of Pitt, he attacked the governments of Rockingham, of Shelburne and of the coalition; of Sheridan, he frequently made caricatures, dwelling especially on his relations with the prince regent; and the caricature, *A Nightmare*, which appeared in *The Anti-Jacobin* in 1799, is one of the most impressive ever drawn. Founded on a picture by Fuseli, it shows Fox hag-ridden and otherwise tortured in sleep by phantoms of the French revolution. Sayer was also, to some degree, a poet: he wrote satires, and also the poem on the death of Pitt, 'Elijah's Mantle,' which was ascribed to Canning. George Darley is chiefly known as the pictorial satirist of *maccaronis*, as the travelled and effeminate fops of the period were called. Between 1780 and 1785, the supremacy of Sayer was challenged and overthrown by a Scottish caricaturist, James Gillray. Gillray's first caricature was an engraving of lord North, published anonymously in 1769. Till 1780, he was chiefly engaged on social subjects; after 1782, his work was almost exclusively political. He published in that year a series of designs concerning Rodney's victory over De Grasse off Dominica. By 1811, when he became imbecile, he had executed some 1500 caricatures, and won an unique position in his art. The lesson that Hogarth had taught, Gillray mainly neglected. His work is savage and brutal; he can be as bitter as

Swift and as crossgrained and coarse as Smollett. But his vigour was great and his invention fertile; and he demands mention in this chapter because he passed on the lamp to his young friend Thomas Rowlandson. But, before considering Rowlandson and another of his friends, Bunbury, it is necessary to go back and pick up another thread of the story.

Hogarth and his fellows had won for the artist copyright in his own engravings; but the market remained for some years restricted to England. Duties on prints entering France were so high as to close the French market to English artists; meanwhile, French prints found their way in large quantities to London. The removal of this disability of English engravers was chiefly due to the artist and print-seller, John Boydell. Boydell began his successful career by engraving small landscapes, which, because print-shops were few, he exhibited in the windows of toy-shops. From small landscapes he went on to large views of London, Oxford and Cambridge and other places; and, in 1751, having done well with a volume of views in England and Wales, he set up as a print-seller. Ardent in his encouragement of British talent, and aided in the early years of the reign of George III by a bounty allowed to English prints for sale in France, Boydell succeeded in turning the print-trade with that country from an import trade to an export trade with an annual revenue of £200,000. The impulse given to English engraving was, naturally, very strong; and it lasted after the outbreak of the French revolution had destroyed the trade with France. Boydell's illustrated edition of Shakespeare was published in 1802; but he had begun to collect materials for it so early as 1786. His object was to encourage English painting, as he had encouraged English engraving; and he employed the most eminent artists of his day.

With Boydell, the print-seller first developed into the patron and employer, and the development was to have an important, if indirect, influence upon the relations of pictorial art to literature. The large number of capable artists whom the new conditions had brought into being gave pictorial art the power, as it were, of dictating to literature. These artists were accustomed (amid the barrenness and mock-antique solemnity of the academic art of the day) to deal freely and naturally with the common scenes, whether topographical or human, of the world about them. They worked for the people, not for connoisseurs; and, in time, they came to find the need of a literature that should form a vehicle for their productions. This movement was greatly advanced by Rudolph

Ackermann, a German by origin, who, in 1795, opened a print-shop in the Strand. Among Ackermann's achievements was the establishment in England of lithography as a fine art. He used the process largely in his monthly publication, *The Repository of Arts, Literature, Fashions, Manufactures*, which ran from 1809 to 1828. More important to the present subject is the fact that he turned to caricaturists for the provision of illustrated books; and among the earliest that he published was Bunbury's work, *Academy for Grown Horsemen.... by Geoffrey Gambado, Esq.* Henry William Bunbury, sportsman, caricaturist and writer, was already known for his admirable chalk-drawings of scenes in real life, most of which were engraved for him by other artists—Ryland, Gillray, Rowlandson, Watson, Bartolozzi, Bretherton the print-seller and Dickinson. Never treating political matters, he had done good work in social subjects, such as the seven plates entitled *The propagation of a lie*, burlesque designs for *Tristram Shandy*, the plate named *A Chop House*, which contains one of the many caricature portraits of Samuel Johnson, and *A Long Minuet (as danced at Bath)*. Boydell had employed him to make designs for Shakespeare's comedies. To Ackermann, he brought a series of comic plates of horsemanship (a subject that he well understood), accompanied by a descriptive letterpress that is still of a fresh and ingenious humour. Geoffrey Gambado, the supposed author, is described as 'Master of the Horse, Riding Master, and Grand Equerry to the Doge of Venice,' and he is presented as having been drowned at sea while on his way to teach horsemanship to the English. The frontispiece shows him as exceedingly corpulent. The advice given by this worthy Venetian, and the letters supposed to be addressed to him by horsemen anxious for his advice, make up a small and constantly entertaining volume, which is important from several points of view. It is an early example of the literature of sport, in which the succeeding half century was to be rich; it was read and enjoyed by Apperley, Surtees, Smedley and other authors of novels of sport; and it was the first of the illustrated humorous books for which Ackermann's publishing house became famous. Bunbury was far more draughtsman than writer; and, though both letterpress and illustrations were his work, this book must be regarded as an early instance of pictorial art calling literature into being. A few years later, caricature was to prove, through Ackermann again, more markedly the patron of literature in the domain of comedy. Among the artists working

in London was a young man, Thomas Rowlandson, who, after studying, to the great advantage of his art, in Paris, had given up portrait-painting for caricature, or *genre*-painting, in oils, and for brilliant comic sketches, which he tossed off in great quantity. Dissipated and improvident, he was incapable of managing his own affairs, and was all the better for attaching himself to a taskmaster of Ackermann's good sense and acumen. His caricature was occasionally brutal; but he lived in a 'hard-hitting, hard-riding, hard-drinking age,' and he portrayed it faithfully. His friend, John Bannister, the actor, is said to have suggested to him a series of plates representing a country curate travelling about England. Travels were popular at the time. Much of Ackermann's success was won from his series of picturesque tours, to which further reference will be made later; and, whether the idea were Bannister's, or Rowlandson's, or another's, there can be little doubt that it was inspired by the very popular books of travel in England written and illustrated between 1782 and 1809 by William Gilpin. On approving of the idea, Ackermann entrusted the writing of the letterpress to William Combe.

William Combe had begun his literary career with *The Diaboliad* (1776), a savage satire in verse on a nobleman (said to have been Simon, lord Irnham), whose cast-off mistress he had married on a promise of money, that was not paid. Its successors, *The Diabo-lady* and *The Anti-Diabo-lady*, are equally spirited. Combe, as a satirist, is still readable for the vigour and rapidity of his verse; but he had not the temperament nor the talent to achieve greatness. In life and letters alike he was unprincipled; and among his deceptions are the spurious *Letters of the late Lord Lyttelton*, and the spurious *Letters of Sterne to Eliza*, in writing which, no doubt, he drew upon the acquaintance with Sterne which he had formed in Italy. As a hack-writer for a publisher he was valuable, and never more so than when he wrote for Ackermann the verses that were to accompany Rowlandson's drawings of the adventures of Dr Syntax, as the travelling clergyman was named. The work was done, by both artist and author, under extraordinary conditions. A certain quantity had to be supplied monthly for publication in Ackermann's *Poetical Magazine*. One drawing at a time only was sent to Combe, then a man of sixty and confined for debt in the King's Bench prison. Combe, thereupon, wrote, or dictated, the requisite number of lines (the printer, as the story goes, waiting in Combe's presence for his 'copy' lest the dilatory author should postpone

his task). In this disjointed fashion, these two very unsystematic workers produced a poem of nearly ten thousand lines, illustrated by thirty plates and a pictorial frontispiece. It would be juster to say that they produced thirty plates and a pictorial frontispiece illustrated by nearly ten thousand lines. The ideas were Rowlandson's; Combe, the writer, played the part usually played by the illustrator; and the combination provides a capital early instance of an imaginative work written to fit pictures already drawn. The practice continued. This was the genesis of *The Pickwick Papers*; and the modern writer of serial stories for illustrated magazines suffers (if he may be said to suffer) in good company.

Under the title *The Tour of Dr Syntax in search of the Picturesque*, the joint work of Rowlandson and Combe was published in *The Poetical Magazine* in 1809 and onwards, and first appeared as a separate volume in 1812. Its popularity was immediate and very great. The figure of the lean curate and schoolmaster in his scratch wig and his rusty black suit, with his long nose and chin, caught the public fancy; and, doubtless, the device of representing him as a man of learning and of some dignity added to the fun of the ridiculous mishaps into which he fell. In the character of Syntax, Combe attempted to combine Don Quixote with parson Adams; and, though the attempt revealed his shortcomings in imagination and humour, he so far succeeded that Syntax remains good company to this day. Feeling the pinch of poverty, the reverend doctor announces to his busy and shrewish wife that, while his pupils are at home for the summer holidays, he intends to make a tour.

*"I'll make a TOUR—and then I'll WRITE IT.*

You well know what my pen can do,  
And I'll employ my pencil too:—  
I'll ride and *write*, and *sketch* and *print*,  
And thus create a real mint;  
I'll *prose* it here, I'll *verse* it there,  
And *picturesque* it ev'ry where.  
I'll do what all have done before;  
I think I shall—and somewhat more.

So off he sets on his old mare, Grizzle. He falls among robbers; he is pursued by a bull; he mistakes a gentleman's house for an inn; he falls, more than once, into mud or water; he is robbed at a race-meeting; he is carried by Grizzle at full gallop among the cavalry at a review; and he suffers other amusing troubles. But, also, he shows on many occasions learning and good sense beneath

his simplicity. A great eater, a great smoker and a great talker, he is loved for his companionable spirit. He makes powerful friends, and at the close has won not only a handsome price for his book but ecclesiastical preferment which will make him easy for life. Combe's verse ambles along with the very paces of the doctor's Grizzle. It is (like most dictated work) frequently flaccid; and it moralises at too great length and with too little force for modern taste. But it seldom goes for long without wit and sense. It is the verse of an able journalist, as might be said today, who knows what people in the world are talking about. Take, for instance, Syntax's soliloquy on the picturesque. He will paint the cottage, the coppice and the elm-trees; but he will omit the pigs.

For, to say truth, I don't inherit  
This self-same *picturesquish* spirit,  
That looks to nought but what is rough,  
And ne'er thinks Nature coarse enough.  
Their system does my genius shock,  
Who see such graces in a dock;  
Whose eye the *picturesque* admires  
In straggling brambles, and in briers;  
Nay, can a real beauty see  
In a decay'd and rotten tree.

People were talking in those days about the picturesque, the 'trim' of art and so forth; and Combe knew what would interest his readers.

So successful a work was sure to find imitators. Among them were *The Tour of Dr Syntax through London*, *Dr Syntax in Paris* and *The Adventures of Dr Comicus*, a parody of Combe's verses, illustrated by burlesques of Rowlandson's engravings. Ackermann, finding the collaboration profitable, set the same pair to work upon other productions. Rowlandson drew a series of designs of *The Dance of Death*, 'with the View of applying it exclusively to the Manners, Customs, and Character of this Country'; and, as before, Combe 'accompanied with Metrical Illustrations' the drawings as they were delivered to him. Issued originally in successive numbers, *The English Dance of Death* was published in two volumes in 1815—16. Describing the death-scenes of a number of different characters, the verse shows Combe in his most serious mood; but it lacks both impressiveness and variety, while, on the other hand, the plates by Rowlandson are various, impressive and full of the peculiar beauty of this artist's best work. In 1816 came, also, *The Dance of Life*, by Rowlandson and

Combe. The poem and the plates recount the life of a young man of position. Since part of the story concerns a period of dissipation in London, it touches a kind of work to which reference will be made later, and, by comparison, shows Combe, who could be coarse upon occasion, as a writer of some taste and reticence. The two fellow-workers had, by this time, made each other's acquaintance; and Combe implies, in his advertisement prefixed to the poem, that he had suggested to Rowlandson some of the ideas, though, in the main, they had followed their old plan of working. He makes the claim more strongly in the introduction to a second tale of Dr Syntax, to whom they returned in 1819—20. Issued, as a book, in 1820, *The Second Tour of Dr Syntax in Search of Consolation* narrates how the reverend doctor, having lost his vulgar but valued wife, is persuaded by his friends to seek relief in another tour. In the Lakes, Bath, London and elsewhere, Syntax visits scenes and people of interest; and, of such humour as there is, beyond the lively and homely circumstances of Mrs Syntax's death, much is supplied by the Irish manservant who accompanies his master. But Combe was now nearly eighty. A well-read man, he makes free use of his knowledge, but dilutes his originals excessively. His verse is garrulous and spiritless, compared with that of the first tour, and Rowlandson's invention was either flagging or too closely bounded by the scenes that he thought fit to introduce. The work is dull, and was not so popular as its predecessor. In *The Third Tour of Dr Syntax in Search of a Wife*, however, published, as a book, in 1821, both artist and verse-maker revived; the studies of various kinds of women are full of character and give no little information about the feminine types of the day. Finally, in 1822, Rowlandson and Combe produced *Johnny Quae Genus, the Foundling of the late Dr Syntax*, which is the feeblest, and was the least popular, of the series.

Two other series of drawings, which Rowlandson made in lighter vein, may be mentioned here. In 1815, he drew a set of plates for *The Military Adventures of Johnny Newcome*, the letterpress for which was written, probably, by colonel David Roberts, who became a writer after a wound, received in the Peninsular war, had incapacitated him for military service. In 1818 appeared *The Adventures of Johnny Newcome in the Navy*, in which Rowlandson's sixteen plates were accompanied by a poem in four cantos by 'Alfred Burton,' a pseudonym of John Mitford, author of *The Poems of a British Sailor* and



a contributor to *The Scourge*, the journal for which George Cruikshank, also, worked. Mitford, who had served in the navy, was worthy of collaborating with Rowlandson in such a book as this. Verses and drawings alike are full of hearty humour, and there is dramatic quality in their exposition of the troubles of a new hand, of 'larks' at sea and on shore and of the tyranny and brutality that marked the naval service in those days.

Comic drawings, the development of his caricature, were not the only work that Rowlandson did for Ackermann and other publishers. This was an age in which illustrated books of travel became popular; and *Dr Syntax*, as we have seen, satirised a general taste. The fashion owed much to the books of William Gilpin, a clergyman, who, in 1782, published his *Observations on the River Wye and several parts of South Wales*, where the picturesque was easily found. Gilpin, who, in his views on education and on poor-law reform, was in advance of his time, was in advance of it, also, in his drawings, which have been described as studies for landscape rather than portraits of particular places. With the pen, like Dr Syntax, he 'prosed it here and versed it there,' his descriptions erring, as Combe thought, in excess of poetical diction, but being enriched with many ingenious reflections. This handsome work was followed by others of the same kind from his pen and pencil. Volumes on Cumberland and Westmorland, on Hampshire, Sussex and Kent, and on Cambridge, Norfolk, Suffolk and Essex, were published during his life or posthumously; in 1790, he issued *Remarks on Forest Scenery and other Woodland Views (relating chiefly to picturesque beauty), illustrated in the scenes of the New Forest*, with plates by his nephew, William Sawrey Gilpin, who was the first president of the Royal Society of Painters in Water-Colours, or the 'Old Society'; and, in 1798, *Picturesque Remarks on the Western Parts of England and the Isle of Wight*. Gilpin, in fact, was the apostle of the picturesque; and the illustrated tour (which brought Dr Syntax a handsome sum of money) was a fashion of the day. Boydell had followed up his volume of views in England and Wales with two volumes (1794 and 1796) on the Thames, in which the letterpress was written by William Combe; and illustrated books of travel were among the most successful publications of Ackermann, who issued a series of 'picturesque tours' on the Rhine, the Seine, the Thames, in the English Lakes, in India and other works. For his great publication of 1821—6, *The World in Miniature*, the

earlier of the 637 plates were the work of Rowlandson, and the others of William Henry Pyne. To Pyne, who was both painter and writer, Ackermann owed at least the idea of his *Picturesque Sketches of Rustic Scenery*, and his *Views of Cottages and Farm Houses in England and Wales*; Pyne himself wrote the text of *Royal Residences*, which Ackermann issued in 1829 with 100 coloured engravings, and, under the pseudonym Ephraim Hardcastle, was the author of *Wine and Walnuts*, an anecdotal book published in 1823. In antiquarian works, again, literature owed much to the needs of engraving. Pyne and Combe together wrote the text of Ackermann's important publications, the histories of *Westminster Abbey*, of *The University of Oxford* and of *The University of Cambridge*. Rowlandson and Combe were, again, together connected with one of Ackermann's most interesting and valuable works, *The Microcosm of London*, which was issued, in and after 1808, in three volumes. In the many coloured plates that illustrate, or constitute, this work, the figures were drawn by Rowlandson, and the architecture by Augustus Charles Pugin, while the text was written by William Combe. The work is concerned not only with the antiquities of London, but with its contemporary life. It takes in Astley's and the Royal Cockpit, as well as the Charterhouse and Westminster abbey, and to this day remains full of information and interest.

*The Microcosm of London* was dedicated to the prince of Wales, afterwards George IV. So, also, in the year after his accession to the throne, was a less august work, which still, in its way, reflects the interest in London and the interest in ordinary life, both of which had been fostered by the influence of caricature and the increasing popularity of illustrated books. The book referred to was Pierce Egan's *Life in London; or, The Day and Night Scenes of Jerry Hawthorn, Esq. and his elegant friend Corinthian Tom, accompanied by Bob Logic, The Oxonian, in their Rambles and Sprees through the Metropolis*, a work which was issued in and after July 1821, in shilling numbers. Of Pierce Egan, the author of this work, more will be said in connection with books on sport. A journalist, and a wellknown character in his day, he wrote nothing so popular as this *Life in London*. Indeed, the taste for it amounted to a craze. For his illustrations, Egan went to two brothers, Isaac Robert and George Cruikshank, sons of a Scottish artist who had settled in London. George Cruikshank, the younger and abler brother, had

already maintained the succession from Gillray and Rowlandson as a political caricaturist. His designs in *The Scourge* and *The Meteor*; his plates in William Combe's 'hudibrastic poem' *The Life of Napoleon* (1814—15); his coloured etchings in *The Humourist*, a collection of comic tales published in 1819—21, and his many caricatures of Napoleon, of the prince regent and his wife, of Frenchmen and of the excesses of English fashion, had laid the foundations of a fame which was greatly increased by his work for *Life in London*. Each of the coloured plates is stated to be by I. R. and G. Cruikshank; but, later in his life, George Cruikshank, by then a reformed character and an ardent teetotaler, declared that his doubts about the morality of Egan's work had caused him to leave two-thirds of the illustration to be done by his brother Robert. Be that as it may, the success of the work was so great that the artists could not colour the engravings fast enough for the demand. It suited the taste of the time, when a 'fast' life had become a sophisticated and conscious aim. *Life in London* is a guide to a fast life. Egan was a 'sporting' man who did not sport. Except for a jejune described run with hounds, a statement that Corinthian Tom had a set-to with John Jackson, the ex-champion pugilist of England, at his rooms in Bond street, and some praise from Tom's friends for his 'superior style' and 'coolness and skill' in a fencing-bout with O'Shaunnessy, there is not a word of true sport in the book. The remainder is mainly drinking, gambling, rioting, cock-fighting and other branches of debauchery, either practised or contemplated by the friends. It is significant that, of the three adventurers, the name of Corinthian Tom appears in the largest type upon the title-page. Tom, indeed, is the hero of the tale. He is the ideal 'man about town'; and, however lavishly the author may praise his elegance and accomplishment, he remains the type of the polished blackguard, unworthy to associate with his country cousin, Jerry Hawthorn, the cheery fool to whom he shows 'the pleasures of the town,' and only a shade more tolerable than the bestial creature, Bob Logic, who is intended for a model of good-humour and wit. In his first chapter, or 'invocation,' Egan appeals to Fielding, Goldsmith, Smollett and Sterne ('Come, then,' he characteristically writes, 'thou shades of departed talent'). His book, with its leer and wink of knowing vice, its sickly affectation of warning young men from the haunts and pursuits that it lusciously describes, would have disgusted even Sterne in the moments when his physical weakness was most perverting his facile

imagination. The candid rogues of great picaresque fiction would be ashamed to own Tom or Logic for their kin. Thackeray, indulging in sentimental reminiscences in days when 'the literary contents of the book' had 'passed sheer away' from his memory, declared that, in the days when the work appeared,

we firmly believed the three heroes above named to be types of the most elegant, fashionable young fellows the town afforded, and thought their occupations and amusements were those of all high-bred English gentlemen.

Twenty years later, when he had read 'the literary contents of the book' again, he said:

But the style of the writing, I own, was not pleasing to me; I even thought it a little vulgar...and as a description of the sports and amusements of London in the ancient times, more curious than amusing.

Thackeray, therefore, nowhere has a good word to say for anything about *Life in London* except the pictures. 'More curious than amusing' is a just criticism. The work is curious, partly for the details that it furnishes of London life in a period when manners were very pompous or very vulgar; and partly for its wealth in the slang of the time. Egan was a master of the 'flash' and the flashy; and *Life in London* contains as many slang phrases as he could put into it. Two years later, he was to furnish the slang phrases to Francis Grose's *Dictionary of the Vulgar Tongue* (1823); and one of his two illustrators, George Cruikshank, had already drawn a plate for Andrewes's *Dictionary of the Slang and Cant Languages* (1809).

Part of the success enjoyed by the work was due, no doubt, to its readers' belief that they could name the originals of the fictitious characters. Imitations came swift and frequent. In the summer of 1822 plays founded upon the story were being acted at no less than ten theatres in and about London; and among the adapters were Charles Dibdin, whose version was played at the Olympic, and W. T. Moncrieff, whose play ran for more than 300 nights at the Adelphi theatre. It was Moncrieff who, in answer to the accusation that Egan and he had made their age the age of flash, replied in the wellknown but inconclusive saying, 'Any age is better than the age of cant'—cant implying, of course, the protests of certain portions of the press and of some religious bodies. Egan himself produced, in 1822, a dramatic version of the story, which was played without success (save for a pony-race round the theatre) at Astley's. The book was, also, translated into French. Out of the sixty-five imitations of it which Egan stated that he had

reckoned, the most important was *Real Life in London, or, the Rambles and Adventures of Bob Tallyho, Esq. and his cousin, the Hon. Tom Dashall, through the Metropolis; exhibiting a living picture of fashionable characters, manners, and amusements in high and low life*, which was published in sixpenny numbers in 1821, with excellent illustrations by Heath, Alken, Dighton, Rowlandson and others. *Real Life in London* is a pleasanter book than its prototype. Some have held that Egan wrote it; but the author had a purer style, a cleaner mind and a wider knowledge of London than Egan. The book shows many more sides of London life than his; though the formal descriptions of wellknown scenes or buildings, here and there inserted amid matter of a very different character, recall very forcibly Mr Bouncer's letters to his aunt in *Verdant Green*. Another imitation was *Life in Paris: The Rambles of Dick Wildfire* (1821), written, it is suspected, by David Carey, and illustrated by George Cruikshank, who had never been to Paris, but was accustomed to drawing his own idea of French people in his caricatures, and took his scenes from the drawings and paintings of other artists. An offshoot of *Life in London* was *The English Spy: An Original Work, Characteristic, Satirical, and Humorous*, illustrated with many coloured plates, of which the greater number are by 'Robert Transit' (i.e. Robert Cruikshank), at least one (not in his pleasantest vein) by Rowlandson and a few by other hands, and written by 'Bernard Blackmantle,' a pseudonym for Charles Molloy Westmacott. Westmacott, whose *Points of Misery* (1823) was illustrated by George Cruikshank, appears to have been a blackmailer; but he was a spirited and amusing writer, and, though *The English Spy*, both in text and in illustrations, is sometimes as coarse as ever was Smollett in word or Gillray in drawing, it contains many lively representations of life, high and low, gives much curious information about the customs and manners of the day and about real people still recognisable under their fictitious names, and preserves many tales of a past age. It attempts to do for many places in England what *Life in London* and *Real Life in London* had done for the metropolis. Eton and Westminster schools, the university of Oxford, Brighton, Bath and Cheltenham, London and the suburbs of London, Cowes, Portsmouth and Doncaster races, all find a place in Westmacott's racy pages; and Robert Cruikshank's plates are as full of vigour and variety as the author's prose and verse. In or about 1823, a young artist, named Theodore Lane,

brought to Pierce Egan a series of original and effective designs representing the life of an actor from his stage-struck days to his triumph; and round them Egan wrote *The Life of an Actor*, which was published in 1824. Though it suffers from all the faults of Egan's flashy style, the book is well designed and interesting, while the footnotes are full of theatrical stories of various merit. It was Lane, also, who illustrated Egan's *Anecdotes, Original and Selected, of the Turf, the Chase, the Ring, and the Stage*, published in 1827. In the following year, Egan brought out *The Finish to the Adventures of Tom, Jerry, and Logic, in their Pursuits through Life In and Out of London*, with illustrations by Robert Cruikshank. To some extent, the work was intended as a sop to those who had attacked the immorality of *Life in London*. Logic dies, at which no one would be surprised, though it is difficult not to resent the attempt to make his end pathetic. Corinthian Tom, attempting a little genuine sport, breaks his neck in the hunting-field; his cast-off mistress, Corinthian Kate, dies of drink and starvation, and Jerry alone is left alive, to settle down in the country with a virtuous wife. The illustrations are admirable; and the text is more amusing, less vulgarly written and less offensive in subject than that of *Life in London*. Among the books on life in London during the end of the eighteenth and the early years of the nineteenth centuries, one other demands notice, *A Book for a Rainy Day, or Recollections of the Events of the Years 1766—1833* by John Thomas Smith. John Thomas Smith, who was born in a hackney coach on the way from Earl street, Seven Dials, to Great Portland street, on a June evening in 1766 and died in April 1833, was an artist, a writer and a Londoner, and wrote a life of his father's master, the sculptor Nollekens, which is unmatched for malicious candour and vivid detail. Art-student, portrait-painter, sightseer, writer, gossip, and keeper of the prints in the British museum, Smith spent his sixty-seven years in close touch with the artistic and literary life of London. He had a keen curiosity about things and people past and present, a retentive memory and a gift for gossip; and his book is one of the most entertaining and most trustworthy memorials of his period. Published twelve years after his death, it forms a valuable corrective to the flashy fictions of Egan and his like.

It is significant that, within twelve hours of the appearance of *Life in London*, the title, the names and the story were seized upon by James Catnach, who put forth, from his printing-house

in Monmouth court, Seven Dials, a twopenny broadside, entitled *Life in London; or, the Sprees of Tom and Jerry; attempted in cuts and verse*, with twelve plates very roughly imitated from the Cruikshanks'. James Catnach had long been doing for the poor what Egan attempted to do for the rich—provide them with highly seasoned literature. The son of a north-country printer who, at Alnwick, had issued volumes illustrated by the woodcuts of Bewick and Clennell, James Catnach set up as a printer of popular literature in Seven Dials in the year 1813. He was the most eminent and successful of his class, though the rivalry of the older business of Pitts, in Great St Andrew street hard by, was at first severe. In those days, when newspapers cost 7*d.* or 8½*d.*, and good cheap literature was all but unknown, Catnach performed an important service for the working classes. He printed and sold illustrated books for children, some at a farthing, some at a halfpenny, some at a few pence; and very good, in their way, they were, with their simple renderings of famous fairy stories, their moral lessons and improving or amusing verses. He wrote, or procured for so much as 2*s.* 6*d.* apiece from the street poets, ballads on passing events—the battle of Waterloo, the death of princess Charlotte, the attempt to rid Covent garden theatre of what Tom and Jerry called 'gay Cyprians,' while Tom Dashall and Bob Tallyho knew them as 'dashing.' Catnach sold history at one penny a sheet; he mourned the death of Jack Randall, the eminent pugilist; he published very interesting cuts of the cries of London; he gave, from day to day, a vivid and various picture of the life of his times; and in his broadsheets and flysheets may be found the mind of the labouring and the criminal classes of his period. To Catnach one may turn for information about coaching, about omnibuses, about Sir Robert Peel's new and derided police—about all the turbulent life of the London streets. He dealt, also, largely in fiction disguised as truth—much as a modern newspaper does. Part of the handsome fortune that he made must have arisen from the dreadful scandals, the duels between ladies of fashion, the elopements and so forth, that he invented for the delectation of his readers' hearty appetites. But chiefly he was known for his works on crime. Those were the days of highwaymen; and about highwaymen, whom the educated classes knew to be pitiful scoundrels, there is practically no contemporary literature except that of the kind published by Catnach or Pitts. Those were the days of public executions, when not only a gay demeanour but a confession and 'last words' were expected

of the criminal. The ordinary of Newgate usually published a paper; but his accounts were jejune, compared with those that Catnach or Pitts could produce. There was a safe and brisk market for 'Last Sorrowful Lamentations,' with portrait, confession and a woeful ballad, all on one sheet. In the description of murders Catnach excelled. On the occasion of the famous 'Red Barn' murder, in 1828, Catnach sold, it is said, more than one million copies of the murderer Corder's confession and a ballad. Previously, he had done very well with the yet more famous murder of Weare by Thurtell, in 1823.

Catnach, however, did not enjoy the field of murder all to himself. At this period, the interest in brutal crime and more brutal punishment was, perhaps, even livelier in all classes than it is today. On the Cato street conspiracy of 1820 *The Observer* newspaper sailed to triumph. Clement, the proprietor, not only gave pictures of the stable and hayloft in Cato street where the conspirators were captured, but defied the law by publishing a full account of the trial before the verdict was given. On the occasion of the murder of Weare by Thurtell, he was yet more lavish, and was, indeed, held to have overstepped the mark of propriety. The objections, which were levelled chiefly at the illustrations, may be held to have been captious, and even inspired, to some extent, by the envy of less enterprising newspapers; for these were days when no reputable journal was ashamed to give great prominence to reports of crime: even *The Annual Register* published the evidence and the verdict in important cases. These were the days, too, when *The Newgate Calendar* was brought out. The original series, *The Newgate Calendar; or, Malefactors' Bloody Register*, published in or about 1774, contained in its five volumes notorious crimes from 1700 to the date of publication. Between 1824 and 1826, Andrew Knapp and William Baldwin, attorneys-at-law, issued, in four volumes, *The Newgate Calendar, comprising interesting memoirs of the most notorious characters*; and, in or about 1826, they issued, in six volumes, *The New Newgate Calendar*, which consisted of their original series much enlarged and with the preface abbreviated. The *Calendar* consists of the lives, crimes, trials and (where inflicted) tortures and executions, of criminals of many kinds, from miserable thieves or forgers to murderers, from murderers to those accused of rebellion and high treason. It is, indeed, as Sir Walter Scott's little friend, Marjory Fleming, said, 'a book that contains all the Murders: all the Murders did I say, nay all



Thefts and Forgeries that ever were committed.' Of *The Newgate Calendar*, there is no better critic than Marjory Fleming. 'The Newgate Calendar,' she writes, 'is very instructive [and] Amusing, and shews us the nesesity of doing good and not evil.' 'The history of all the Malcontents that ever was hanged is very amusing,' she writes later; but, at the same time, it 'fills me with horror and consternation.' The author of the very improving preface to the first series could have said no more. Knapp and Baldwin, in the preface to their earlier series, attempt to connect their labours with the protest, then being raised, against the severity of the English law; but Marjory Fleming goes to the root of the matter. *The Newgate Calendar* stands at the head of the English literature of crime. It was worth the while of attorneys-at-law to do for the educated classes what Catnach and others had long been doing for the poor; and *The Newgate Calendar* was developed out of the sheets sold by hawkers at public executions.

The success of *Life in London* was partly due, no doubt, to Pierce Egan's great personal popularity; he was known as 'Glorious Pierce,' and the prince regent had commanded that he should be presented at court. For Egan was the first great sporting journalist, in days when journalism had discovered the dignity and the beneficence of sport. To understand Egan's eminence in this field, it is necessary to go back some years. The eighteenth century—the century, in England, of reason and system—systematised, to some extent, English sport. From the eighteenth century, the then distinctively English sport of pugilism received organisation and science. In the reign of George I, fighting with fists had begun to take the place of the combats with sword or cudgel. James Fig, 'the father of the ring,' who opened in 1719 the Academy in Tottenham-court road, where the famous captain Godfrey and other athletes exhibited their skill, was swordsman as well as boxer. It remained for Jack Broughton, the champion from 1734 to 1750, to reduce boxing to an accurate science; and Daniel Mendoza, champion from 1784 to 1820, introduced 'a new, a more rapid, and more elegant style of boxing, and a more artistic *technique*.' By the close of the eighteenth century, boxing had not only, like hunting, become systematised; thanks to the pleasure taken in the prize-ring by the prince of Wales and his brothers, pugilism was the most fashionable of amusements and of spectacles. The passion for this form of sport ran through all classes, and was more ardent even than the modern passion for

football. On the one hand, it may be remembered that the last desire expressed before execution by Thurtell, the murderer of Weare, was 'to read Pierce Egan's account of the great fight yesterday.' On the other hand, a man of intellect, like William Hazlitt, was a genuine lover of sport, and would take infinite trouble to see a prize-fight. In *The New Monthly Magazine* for February 1822<sup>1</sup>, Hazlitt describes how he travelled on a cold and wet December night to Hungerford, and went bedless, in order to see 'the Gas-man' (Thomas Hickman) fight Bill Neate. The paper gives what is, perhaps, the most vivid description of a prize-fight ever written. The reader may realise by its means all the details of prize-fighting that to modern taste appear brutal and disgusting; but he will be left in no doubt about the pluck and endurance displayed by the fighters, and, in Hazlitt's comments upon Hickman's 'vapouring and swaggering,' he will find an admirable statement of the virtues of the true sportsman. Indeed, the whole position of sport had changed. That athletic exercises were considered worthy of serious attention, the great illustrated work of the artist and antiquary, Joseph Strutt, *The Sports and Pastimes of the People of England from the earliest period* (first published in 1801) is a sign. And to pugilism, even more than to hunting, the patriots of the day liked to point, as both proving and developing those qualities—courage, endurance, 'bottom,' or unquenchable spirit—which were held to make the true Briton the equal of any three or more Frenchmen. In the rooms of John Jackson (Byron's tribute to Jackson as man and as boxer will be remembered), Tom and Jerry were shown a picture of an assassination in Rome, the victim having been stabbed with a dagger; and Logic's comment was:

When comparisons are made, the above plate speaks volumes in favour of the manly and generous mode resorted to by Englishmen to resent an insult or to decide a quarrel.

Pugilism, though already subject to attack as brutal and ferocious, had the great heart of the country behind it. In the service of pugilism Egan made his fame. He was not, of course, the first writer on boxing. Captain Godfrey brought out, in or about 1740, a small *Treatise on the Useful Art of Self-defence*. Paul Whitehead had sung of the art in *The Gymnasiad* (1757); John Byrom, Robert Barclay and others, had celebrated it in prose or verse; and the journals, including *The Gentleman's Magazine*, *The Flying*

<sup>1</sup> *Collected Works of William Hazlitt*, ed. Waller and Glover, vol. xii, p. 1.

*Post*, *The World* and others, had published accounts of prize-fights. But Egan was the first to make a name for himself as a sporting journalist. Writing in a florid, slipshod style, by no means devoid of vigour and vividness, he described the fights with understanding and at the same time with what many of his readers probably mistook for 'a literary touch'; and his example has not yet completely faded from journalism. In 1824, he began editing a weekly paper, *Pierce Egan's Life in London and Sporting Guide*, which, later, developed into the more famous sporting journal *Bell's Life in London*. Egan's *Book of Sports and Mirror of Life* (1832) is a valuable compilation; but his most successful work on sport was his illustrated book, *Boxiana; or, Sketches of Antient and Modern Pugilism, from the days of the renowned Broughton and Slack, to the championship of Crib*. The work was founded on an earlier work of the same title, produced by George Smeeton in 1812. The first two volumes of Egan's book were issued in 1818; and a third in 1821. A new series<sup>1</sup>, in two volumes, was issued in 1828 and 1829. Here may be read the lives and achievements of Fig, Broughton, Jackson, Gulley, Mendoza, Molineaux, Tom Crib, Tom Spring, Jem Ward—of all the great and lesser heroes of 'the fancy.' Henry Downes Miles, who, in 1906, published *Pugilistica*, the three volumes of which carried the story of British boxing down to Sayers and Tom King and the end of the prize-ring, frequently accuses Egan of inaccuracy; but his book, for nearly a century, was the standard history of the art, and, in his own day, was the classic work upon the principal British sport. Among many other publications of the time concerned with boxing, an honourable place is held by the illustrated journal, *The Fancy*, which, between 1821 and 1826, published memoirs of famous pugilists, accounts of fights, general sporting intelligence and a few pages of miscellaneous news, all of which are rich in information on the vigorous and not squeamish sporting activities of the period.

Hunting, like pugilism, though in a less degree, was systematised by the eighteenth century, and became a subject of popular, as well as practical, literature. During the first half, or more, of the century, every country gentleman hunted, but very many country gentlemen kept their own packs, which were small and not choicely bred. Few of them, probably, were maintained on even so steady, if so nicely 'humorous' a principle as those musical fellows of Coverly hall in Warwickshire. Squire Western's hounds have

<sup>1</sup> For bibliographical details, see *Pugilistica*, 1906, p. xi.

not been closely described ; but it is not unlikely that, in spite of Gervase Markham's works, and Richard Blome's *The Gentleman's Recreation* of 1683, and the amount of science displayed by Somerville in *The Chace*, such hounds as those of lord Scattercash were not so rare in the mid-eighteenth century as in the mid-nineteenth. Then came a remarkable master of hounds—one who, according to a writer commonly supposed to be Sir Egerton Brydges, could 'bag a fox in Greek, find a hare in Latin, inspect his kennels in Italian, and direct the economy of his stables in exquisite French'—a scholar and a sportsman, Peter Beckford. Beckford, in 1781, published at Salisbury a quarto volume, *Thoughts upon Hare and Fox Hunting*, which has been held to 'mark an era not only in the literature but in the history of hunting.' This work, and the same author's *Essays on Hunting*, laid the foundation of the art of hunting ; and Peter Beckford's name has been held in veneration not only by 'Nimrod' and other writers on the sport, but by all serious students and practitioners of the art. After Beckford, good books on hunting became fairly numerous ; and among them should be mentioned *The British Sportsman* by Samuel Howitt, a sportsman and artist, who married a sister of Rowlandson and worked in close contact with his brother-in-law. Hunting, coaching, and all sports with horses offered an attractive field to the artists of the day, as well as to the writers ; and Bunbury proved to be the ancestor of a long and numerous line, which includes George Cruikshank, Leech, Robert Seymour and many other famous names. Among the earliest successors of Bunbury is Henry Alken, who did excellent sporting pictures between 1816 and 1831. A man of obscure origin (he is supposed to have been stud-groom or trainer to the duke of Beaufort before he won fame as an artist), Alken was commended by a writer (probably Christopher North) in *Blackwood's Magazine* for his understanding of English gentlemen—a subject in which George Cruikshank was held to fail. In the great popularity of sport, Alken found ready employment as draughtsman. His *National Sports of Great Britain* contains fifty admirable coloured engravings, in which his accurate knowledge and his artistic sense are cleverly combined ; to *The Analysis of the Hunting Field*, a volume of papers on the components of a hunt reprinted from *Bell's Life in London*, he contributed six of his finest designs ; and his comic series, *Specimens of Riding, Symptoms of being amazed* and others, deserve the popularity they achieved. If Alken could draw like

a gentleman, he was soon to be associated with one who could write like a gentleman. When Lockhart said of 'Nimrod' that he could 'hunt like Hugo Meynell and write like Walter Scott,' he was doubtless excited into exaggeration by the pleasure of having hit upon a man who could write of sport without the vulgarity of Egan. 'Nimrod,' whose name was Charles James Apperley was a man of education, a country squire and a genuine sportsman. Loss of means turned him to literature; he contributed articles on sport to *The Sporting Magazine*, *The Quarterly Review* and other journals; but is best known by his two books, *The Life of a Sportsman*, and *Memoirs of the Life of John Mytton*, both of which were illustrated with coloured engravings by Alken. *The Life of a Sportsman*, published in 1842, contains a very pleasant account of country life in days when sport was no longer confused with debauchery; while its descriptions of runs to hounds, its lore of hunting and of four-in-hand driving<sup>1</sup> and its variety of incident and anecdote make it still both valuable and agreeable. Apperley, though not a Walter Scott, was a good writer; he knew his subject thoroughly, on both the scientific and the personal sides, and this work of fiction, though poor in plot, is rich in interest. *Memoirs of the life of John Mytton* appeared as a book in 1837, a portion of the work having been printed in *The New Sporting Magazine* in 1835. It shows a difficult task performed with fidelity and tact. Apperley had been Mytton's neighbour in Shropshire, and had extended to him all the care that was possible when both were living in Calais in order to avoid their creditors. Apperley's task was to write the life of a man who, while he was one of the most heroic sportsmen that ever lived, was also drunken, diseased and insane; and he performed the task with admirable judgment.

Before the death of Apperley, a new sporting writer, of a more humorous turn, had begun a brilliant career. Like 'Nimrod,' Robert Smith Surtees was both sporting writer and sportsman. The second son (and, in his fortieth year, the successor) of a Yorkshire landowner, he contributed in youth to *The Sporting Magazine*, and, in 1831, started, with Rudolf Ackermann the younger, *The New Sporting Magazine*, which he edited till 1856. Here first appeared the comic papers, which, in 1838, were published in a book under the title of *Jorrocks' Jaunts and Jollities*, with coloured plates by Alken. Lockhart shared the general

<sup>1</sup> For the driving of stage-coaches, see Cross, Thomas, *The Autobiography of a Stage Coachman*, 1861.

admiration for these comic sketches of sporting life, and urged Surtees to write a book. Surtees made further use of the conception of Mr Jorrocks, the grocer of sporting tastes, and produced *Handley Cross, or the Spa Hunt*, which was enlarged into *Handley Cross, or Mr Jorrocks' Hunt*, with pictures by John Leech. Then came *Hawbuck Grange*, illustrated by 'Phiz' (Hablot Knight Browne); *Ask Mamma, or The Richest Commoner in England*; *Mr Sponge's Sporting Tour*, illustrated by Leech; and *Mr Facey Romford's Hounds*, illustrated by Leech and Browne, besides other novels. Surtees was also the author of the papers in *Bell's Life in London*, some of which were issued, with illustrations by Alken, in a volume mentioned above, *The Analysis of the Hunting Field*. It is possible that the true worth of Surtees's work has been a little obscured by the fame of the author of *Pickwick*, of which the original idea, a tale of cockney sporting life, was to some extent suggested by the adventures of Mr Jorrocks. Surtees is a comic writer of a broad and hearty humour and a deft and subtle touch. In the invention of comic character and speech, he comes second only to Dickens. Mr Jorrocks, 'Facey' Romford, lord Scamperdale and his friend Jack Spraggon, Mr Sponge, Mr Jawleyford of Jawleyford court—these, with nearly every character that Surtees troubles to elaborate, are rich in humour; while the dialogue in these novels has a force and a flavour comparable only with that in Dickens, or in some piece of flourishing invective in Nashe or Greene. Surtees's comedy is, doubtless, like that of Dickens, mainly a comedy of 'humours' or personal oddities; and Surtees, it must be admitted, was careless about construction and about such necessary ingredients of a novel as did not interest him; but all the fun is rooted in human nature, and set out with abounding energy. Surtees was fortunate in the assistance of two young artists who were then carrying on the succession of Alken and George Cruikshank. Both John Leech and H. K. Browne were keen sportsmen and good artists; and, though Leech never learned to draw a horse, while Browne's horses were as good as Alken's, both men were comic draughtsmen of inventiveness and humour. Browne found good material in the novels of another sporting writer, Francis Edward Smedley, a cripple with a taste for sporting literature. Smedley, who was for three years editor of *George Cruikshank's Magazine*, wrote three novels of high spirits and rapid comedy, *Frank Fairleigh*, *Lewis Arundel* and *Harry Coverdale's Courtship*; of which the first is still, and deservedly, popular.

The illustrations to the books of which mention has been made were etched and then coloured by hand. Meanwhile, the art of wood-engraving, which had become degraded and neglected, was revived about the close of the eighteenth century by Thomas Bewick. Bewick and his pupils spread abroad the practice of the art; and thus there came into being a means of illustration in black and white very serviceable for the use of the periodical press. Much as the vitality of pictorial art had helped to bring into being the literature of the various kinds that have been described above, so the existence of a number of able engravers on wood helped to bring into being an illustrated press. In the early years of the nineteenth century, *The Observer*, *Bell's Life in London* and other papers owned by William Clement, had made a special feature of their illustrations; and *The Observer* was quick to take advantage of the revival in the art of wood-engraving. At the same time, the refinement of taste and manners brought the need of a comic journalism that should be free of scurrility and other offence; and, before the middle of the nineteenth century, the two influences had combined to produce the most famous of comic journals, *Punch*. To the making of *Punch* and its various component parts, several streams flowed. Some of them have already been noticed in this chapter: the burlesque of the illustrated tour; the illustrated comedy of sport; the political or social caricature; the book of anecdote and jest. George Cruikshank, who, in the art of comic draughtsmanship, marks the transition from the brutality of Gillray or Rowlandson to the delicate humour of du Maurier or Tenniel, issued, for some years after 1835, a *Comic Almanack*, to which eminent authors, among them Thackeray, contributed; and Thomas Hood had founded his famous *Comic Annual* in 1830. Account must, also, be taken of certain comic journals that had preceded *Punch*, among them, especially, the *Figaro* and the *Charivari* of Paris. The honour of producing the first English comic journal comparable with *Punch* belongs to Gilbert Abbott à Beckett, one of many lively young humourists, the majority of whom became contributors to the most successful of comic papers. À Beckett, who was a barrister, and became a police magistrate, started, in 1813, an illustrated comic journal entitled *Figaro in London*, which was illustrated by Robert Seymour and, after him, by Robert Cruikshank. This journal à Beckett conducted for three years, and among his many other ventures were *The Wag* and *The Comic Magazine*. One of his literary contributors was his successor as

editor of *Figaro*, Henry Mayhew, and one of his artists William Newman, who afterwards did valuable work for *Punch*. *Punchinello*, illustrated by Robert Cruikshank, was another, and a short-lived, predecessor of *Punch*. Douglas Jerrold's *Punch in London* was yet another. In 1830 and onwards, a large amount of young and eager comic talent, both in art and in literature, was finding expression; and, in 1841, the best of it combined in the production of the most respectable and most popular of comic journals. The facts of the founding of *Punch* have been disputed. The authorised view<sup>1</sup> is that Ebenezer Landells, a newspaper projector, and a wood-engraver who had learned his art from Bewick, had the idea of a comic journal similar to the Paris *Charivari*—an idea that had previously been all but brought to fruit by Douglas Jerrold, Thackeray, Kenny Meadows, Leech and others. After suggesting the idea to several publishers in vain, Landells took it to the printer, Joseph Last, who entertained it favourably, and sent him to see Henry Mayhew, the son of Last's legal adviser. Mayhew took him on to see Mark Lemon, a publican turned dramatist, and the list of the staff was thereupon drawn up. At the next meeting, Mayhew, Lemon and Stirling Coyne were appointed joint-editors; Archibald S. Henning, cartoonist; Brine, John Phillips and William Newman artists in ordinary, and Lemon, Coyne, Mayhew, Gilbert Abbott à Beckett and W. H. Wills (who was subsequently secretary to Charles Dickens), the literary staff. The first number, which appeared on 17 July 1841, contained contributions, also, by Henry Grattan (whose full name was Henry Grattan Plunkett, and whose pseudonym was 'Fusbos'), Joseph Allen, an artist, and F. G. Tomlins. Before the appearance of the second number the staff had been joined by Douglas Jerrold. Later additions to the list of contributors in the early days of the journal's existence were Percival Leigh (whose pseudonym was 'Paul Prendergast'), the author of *The Comic Latin Grammar*, a doctor by profession, and a scholarly and gentle-minded wit; Albert Smith, well known for his popular lectures on the ascent of Mont Blanc; H. A. Kennedy; William Maginn; John Oxenford, dramatic critic; Thackeray and Horace Mayhew, younger brother of Henry Mayhew.

To the influence of Henry Mayhew has been ascribed the geniality of tone which differentiated *Punch* from *Charivari*; but that geniality was tempered, in and after the second number, by the work of the most remarkable among the early writers for

<sup>1</sup> Spielmann, M. H., *The History of Punch*, 1895, chap. 1.



*Punch*. Douglas William Jerrold was a dramatist and wit who had already made his mark with his play, *Black-eyed Susan*, and his studies of *Men of Character* (1838), for which Thackeray drew illustrations. His papers in *Punch*, signed 'Q,' the first of which appeared on 12 September 1841, were the contributions that attracted attention to the paper; and Jerrold's work, thenceforth, gave *Punch* its tone. Here appeared, in 1843, *Punch's letters to his son*; in 1845, *Punch's Complete Letter-writer*; and *Mrs Caudle's Curtain Lectures*, which was issued as a book in 1846. Jerrold wrote several other serial works for *Punch*, yet none so popular as *Mrs Caudle*. This series, more genially humorous and less satirical than most of Jerrold's work, made the fortune of *Punch*. But, in the earlier years of the paper, it was not Jerrold's comedy but his more serious writing—the social and political articles signed 'Q'—that gave the journal its character and distinction. Jerrold was a man of hasty temper and caustic tongue, but of a warm heart and of quick sympathy with the oppressed. In his political philosophy, there may have been some traces of the school of Godwin; but his leading idea (or sentiment) was the wickedness of the rich and the oppressed innocence of the poor. With satire (sometimes personal) and invective, he fought hard and fearlessly, if not always wisely, in a good cause; and he gave to *Punch* its trend towards liberalism in politics. Thackeray began his connection with *Punch* with *Miss Tickletoy's Lectures on English History*, and drawings to illustrate, occasionally other people's, but usually his own, writings. In *Punch*, too, appeared his *Diary of Fitz-Jeames de la Pluche*; his *Snobs of England*, and his *Punch's Prize Novelists*. His regular connection with *Punch* practically ended in 1851, though his last contribution to it was published in 1854. In *Miss Tickletoy's Lectures* some have seen the germ of *The Comic History of England* and *The Comic History of Rome*, written by Gilbert Abbott à Beckett, and illustrated by John Leech. Besides these two prolonged efforts of humour, which, considering the extent and nature of the task, is wonderfully well maintained, à Beckett wrote a brilliant piece of parody, *The Comic Blackstone*, illustrated by George Cruikshank and John Leech, which, even more than the *Histories*, has an instructive, as well as a comic, value, and has even been recommended as a text-book of law. Some of à Beckett's best work for *Punch* consisted of the articles on the trials of a young barrister which were signed 'Mr Briefless': a series which gave

rise, many years later, to the letters of 'A. Briefless, Junior,' contributed to *Punch* by Gilbert Abbott à Beckett's son, Arthur William à Beckett, who, with his brother, Gilbert Arthur à Beckett, was to join the staff of *Punch* in later years.

Thomas Hood<sup>1</sup> began to contribute to *Punch* in 1843, and amused himself and his readers with his attacks on the plagiarist, lord William Lennox, at whom Jerrold and other wits also had their fling. Hood is best known, however, as a contributor to *Punch*, by the famous *Song of the Shirt*, which appeared in the Christmas number of the year 1843. The year 1844 increased the number of contributors by Kenealy, J. W. Ferguson and Tom Taylor, whose connection with the paper remained unbroken till his death in 1880. Mark Lemon, into whose hands the sole editorship of the paper soon passed, remained in control of it for twenty-nine years : a wise and capable director of a journal which, by means of the celebrated weekly dinners, has always been conducted on the principle of co-operation and mutual criticism among the members of the staff. On his death in 1870 he was succeeded by Shirley Brooks, who was the first to start the now distinctive feature of the paper, *Essence of Parliament*; and, on the death of Brooks in 1874, Tom Taylor became editor and retained the post till his death. Meanwhile, the new contributors had included : in 1845, Watts Phillips, the dramatist; in 1846, 'Jacob Omnium' (Matthew J. Higgins); in 1847, Horace Smith, part-author, with his brother James, of *Rejected Addresses*; in 1848, Henry Silver and Sutherland Edwards; in 1850, James Hannay; while other important contributors were Reynolds Hole, dean of Rochester, and Charles L. Eastlake, keeper of the National Gallery. In 1845 appeared Coventry Patmore's single contribution to *Punch*, a poem on the massacre of Arabs at Dahra; and in 1846 came Tennyson's reply in verse to an attack on him by Bulwer Lytton. The artists who drew for the paper included, besides Thackeray and others previously mentioned, H. G. Hine, Alfred Forrester ('Alfred Crowquill'), Sir John Gilbert, Hablot K. Browne, who worked for *Punch* from 1842 to 1869; Richard Doyle, whose work appears first in the same Christmas number for 1843 that contained Hood's *The Song of the Shirt*, and who is best known by the cover still in use; and 'Cuthbert Bede' (Edward Bradley), the author of *Verdant Green*, a book which carried on the tradition of *The English Spy* and *Life in London*. *Punch*, however, is chiefly famous for its five principal artists. John Leech had been

<sup>1</sup> See, *ante*, vol. xii, chap v.

drawing for *Bell's Life in London* when he was brought to *Punch* by Percival Leigh. By 1844, he was paramount on the artistic side of the paper and in the cartoons. His studies of low life; his scenes in the life of sport (in which Mr Briggs revives, to some extent, the humours of Mr Jorrocks); his ridicule of the beards and moustaches that had come into fashion after the Crimean war, of the female movement known as 'Bloomerism' and of the crinoline—all these present a full and lively picture of the age on its social side, filled with gentle satire, never coarse, and only unfair, perhaps, in the case of the Volunteer movement. In 1850 John Tenniel began his work for *Punch*, and brought into the paper the dignity which, during his career, gave to *Punch's* pictorial comments on political affairs an impressive weight without loss of fun. In the following year, Charles Keene, introduced by Henry Silver, began those studies of homely humour which continued the tradition of the earlier works by Leech. In 1860, George du Maurier, the typical satirist of the mid-Victorian era, put upon *Punch* the seal of 'gentility.' The follies and foibles of 'society,' the mistakes of the vulgar, the beauty of refined womanhood were the themes of this delicate art. And, in 1867, Linley Sambourne brought in his lively fancy, graceful humour and decorative design.

*Punch* has had many rivals, the most important of which were Tom Hood's *Fun*, illustrated by E. G. Dalziel, and *Judy*, illustrated by Calvert. None of the rivals, however, was able to sustain the freshness of interest, combined with the moderation and refinement which have preserved, though they did not create, the eminence of *Punch*. During most of the years of the journal's existence it has proved a faithful mirror of the changing times; and the art, literature, politics and manners of the age cannot be studied without it.

## CHAPTER VII

### THE LITERATURE OF TRAVEL, 1700—1900

A CHAPTER on the literature of travel must treat of widely different things, and should open with some attempt at definition. The phrase 'literature of travel' suggests, in the first instance, such books as Sterne's *Sentimental Journey*, Kinglake's *Eothen*, Borrow's *Bible in Spain*, Dufferin's *Letters from High Latitudes*, Stevenson's *Inland Voyage*—books in which the personality and literary power of the writer count for more than his theme, books which need not treat of anything new, but merely of something sufficiently unusual to provide an interesting topic for a writer who, in any case, would be interesting. The travels described in such narratives need not be historical or intrinsically notable. Their value rather lies in this, that they provide a topic for literature. Their writers are known rather as authors than as travellers. But such books are, relatively, few. Most writers on travel are remembered as travellers rather than as authors, and the value of their works lies not so much in revealing the personality and literary power of the writer as in successfully describing his journeys and discoveries. 'No one expects literature in a book of travel,' says Mary Kingsley. Countless printed pages record the travels and discoveries of two centuries. This chapter can only be kept within reasonable limits by recognising that the literature of travel and the written records of travel are not the same thing. The present purpose is to mention such books only as can claim to belong to literature. Any general definition would be difficult, since every work must be judged by its own merits, and the best books possess an individuality which refuses to be reduced to categories. Moreover, established reputation must be taken into account: for any work which stands as the monument of a great achievement, apart from purely technical or scientific matter, has won a place in literature.

Yet, in general, there are two qualifications. In the first place,

one who writes about travel should have something of the born traveller in him, something of the spirit of Tennyson's *Ulysses* or Browning's *Waring*. 'Whatever we do, let us not sit still; there's time enough for that when we lose the use of our legs.' So writes a notable traveller, now little read, E. D. Clarke; and, again, 'The joy I feel in the prospect of visiting the countries within the Arctic is not to be expressed.' Secondly, the author must write in the same vein, so that the narrative shall itself reflect the spirit and passion of travel which possesses the writer.

In a travel-book, viewed as literature, accuracy is no merit, unless the style and character of the work enjoin accuracy. Thus, in Dampier's *Journals* or Cook's *Narrative* or Darwin's *Voyage of the Beagle*, since the very nature and purpose of these books stamp them as faithful records, any flaw in accuracy would be a literary flaw. But, in reading Borrow's *Bible in Spain*, one of the finest travel-books ever written, no one pauses to ask whether every page depicts actual occurrences exactly as they happened. For Borrow, catching the very spirit of the picaresque romance, gives a truer picture of Spain than any accurate description could offer. He views and depicts the country in the light of his own sympathetic genius.

In books of discovery, since they are, in some sort, scientific histories, accuracy is demanded; yet, even in this kind, there are exceptions—for example, Bruce's *Travels in Abyssinia*. Here, the veteran hero, telling his story years after the event, views through the magnifying haze of memory, illuminated by a picturesque and transparent personal vanity, the fantastic and exotic melodrama in which he had played a part. It matters little if his narrative was coloured by his dreams. He has painted for us the true Abyssinia as no one else could have done.

William Dampier, sailor, logwood-cutter, buccaneer or pirate, privateer and explorer, may be regarded as the pioneer of modern travellers. At two-and-twenty, he became under-manager of a Jamaica estate; but soon wandered away to trade, to logwood-cutting in Yucatan and to buccaneering. For seven years (1679—86), he served under various pirate-captains along the Spanish Main and in the Pacific, and then spent five adventurous years (1686—91) wandering homewards from California by the East Indies and the Cape. After publishing narratives of his voyages, he was sent by the admiralty as commander of an exploring expedition to New Holland (Australia). His ship foundered

'through perfect age' at Ascension on the homeward voyage. Dampier was afterwards tried by court-martial for cruelty to his lieutenant, was found guilty and declared unfit to command a king's ship. However, he soon sailed in command of two privateers to the South sea (1703—7) upon a voyage diversified by mutinies, desertions and disruption. In 1708—11, Dampier served as pilot to the privateer Woodes Rogers.

Dampier's experiences as logwood-cutter and pirate supply the best part of his writings. This common seaman, serving before the mast in a pirate-ship, writes with a curious gentleness and sympathy and in vigorous, dignified, expressive prose. A born wanderer and observer, he describes with quaint and picturesque fidelity seas, coasts, people, plants and animals. His observations on peoples, customs and trade have a distinct historical value.

All the Indians that I have been acquainted with who are under the Spaniards seem to be more melancholy than other Indians that are free; and at these public meetings when they are in the greatest of their jollity, their mirth seems to be rather forced than real. Their songs are very melancholy and doleful, so is their music; but whether it be natural to the Indians to be thus melancholy or the effect of their slavery, I am not certain. But I have always been prone to believe that they are then only condoling their misfortunes, the loss of their country and liberties, while although those that are now living do not know nor remember what it was to be free, yet there seems to be a deep impression in their thoughts of the slavery which the Spaniards have brought them under, increased probably by some traditions of their ancient freedom.

He thus describes a piratical episode in Nicaragua :

The next morning the Spaniards killed one of our tired men. He was a stout old grey-headed man, aged about eighty-four, who had served under Oliver in the time of the Irish Rebellion; after which he was at Jamaica, and had followed privateering ever since. He would not accept of the offer our men made him to tarry ashore, but said he would venture as far as the best of them; and when surrounded by the Spaniards he refused to take quarter, but discharged his gun amongst them, keeping a pistol still charged; so they shot him dead at a distance. His name was Swan. He was a very merry hearty old man, and always used to declare he would never take quarter.

Captain Woodes Rogers, commander of two privateer ships, wrote an admirable account of his expedition (1712). He briefly describes the outward voyage to Juan Fernandez, duly narrates with greater fullness the exciting story of his cruise in the south Pacific, the capture of various prizes and of the city of Guayaquil, and the fight with the Manila galleon and her consort. Here and there, the reader is tempted to discern the hand of his pilot Dampier; for example, in the description of 'humming-birds, not much larger than humble-bees, their bills no thicker than a pin,

their legs proportional to their bodies, and their minute feathers of most beautiful colours.' One passage has a permanent and singular interest; it describes how they found on the island of Juan Fernandez

a man clothed in goat-skins, who seemed wilder than the original owners of his apparel. His name was Alexander Selkirk, a Scotsman, who...had lived alone on the island for four years and four months.... He had with him his clothes and bedding, with a firelock and some powder and bullets, some tobacco, a knife, a kettle, a bible, with some other books, and his mathematical implements. He diverted himself and provided for his sustenance as well as he could; but had much ado to bear up against melancholy for the first eight months, and was sore distressed at being left alone in such a desolate place. He built himself two huts...thatched with long grass and lined with goat skins....He...employed himself in reading, praying and singing psalms, so that he said he was a better Christian during his solitude than he had ever been before.... When his clothes were worn out, he made himself a coat and cap of goat-skins, which he stitched together with thongs of the same, cut out with his knife, using a nail by way of a needle or awl.... At his first coming on board, he had so much forgotten his language, for want of use, that we could scarcely understand him, as he seemed to speak his words by halves.

In 1740—4, commodore Anson, afterwards lord Anson and first lord of the admiralty, made his famous voyage round the world. The account of it was the joint production of Anson himself and his chaplain Walter. The narrative closely holds the reader throughout, describing how a squadron of seven vessels sailed from Spithead for the South sea and Panama, there to join hands with Vernon's trans-Atlantic expedition; and how, off Tierra del Fuego, by 'a continual succession of such tempestuous weather as surprised the oldest and most experienced mariners' it was reduced 'to a couple of shattered, half-manned cruisers, and a sloop.' After long refitting at Juan Fernandez, two ships sailed out—once more a formidable fighting force. They attacked and burnt the town of Païta; and, after long watching and waiting, they captured the Manila galleon carrying a million and a half of dollars. Finally, Anson reached home in a single treasure-laden ship.

Thus was this expedition finished, when it had lasted three years and nine months; after having, by its event, strongly evinced this important truth: That though prudence, intrepidity and perseverance united are not exempted from the blows of adverse fortune, yet in a long series of transactions they usually rise superior to its power, and in the end rarely fail of proving successful.

The wreck of the 'Wager,' one of Anson's ships, on a desolate island of southern Chile, produced several narratives. The most notable of these was written twenty-six years after the event by

admiral John Byron, nick-named 'foul-weather Jack,' who had sailed as a young officer in the 'Wager.' It is a most moving and well told story of wanderings by land and sea, and possesses a further literary interest inasmuch as the admiral's more famous grandson used his 'grandad's narrative' for the description of storm and shipwreck in *Don Juan*. A typical passage may be given:

I had hitherto steered the boat; but one of our men, sinking under the fatigue, expired soon after, which obliged me to take the oar in his room and row against this heart-breaking stream. Whilst I was thus employed, one of our men, whose name was John Bosman, tho' hitherto the stoutest man among us, fell from his seat under the thwarts, complaining that his strength was quite exhausted for want of food, and that he should die very shortly. As he lay in this condition, he would every now and then break out in the most pathetic wishes for some little sustenance; that two or three mouthfuls might be the means of saving his life. The Captain at this time had a large piece of boiled seal by him and was the only one that was provided with anything like a meal: but we were become so hardened against the impression of others' sufferings by our own; so familiarised to scenes of this and every other kind of misery, that the poor man's dying entreaties were vain. I sat next to him when he dropped, and having a few dried shell-fish (about five or six) in my pocket, put one from time to time in his mouth, which served only to prolong his pains; from which, however, soon after my little supply failed, he was released by death. For this and another man... we made a grave in the sands.

Several voyages of exploration, despatched to the Pacific in the reign of George III, were described in readable and interesting narratives by their commanders, John Byron (1764—6), Wallis and Carteret (1766—8), James Cook (1768—71, 1772—5, 1776—9) and George Vancouver (1791—5). To the general reader, there is some sameness about the maritime part of these narratives, wherein hardships, dangers and sufferings, the chances of the sea and losses by disease are quietly treated as matters of course, so that the story of a voyage is, in great part, almost like a domestic diary. These narratives become more like travel-books when land is touched. Carteret wrote an entertaining account of his proceedings at Madeira, and Wallis gives a more fresh and lively account of the Society islands, discovered by him, than does his more famous successor Cook.

The pre-eminent interest of Cook's first voyage, the greatest among English voyages of discovery, gives distinction to his narrative; and it seems almost impertinent to criticise as literature the book in which a great man plainly and modestly sets forth a great achievement. Yet, the account which has been most often published was compiled by Hawkesworth from the journals of



Cook and of Joseph Banks, who accompanied the expedition as botanist; and most people will probably find this compilation more readable than Cook's own narrative, and will also find Banks's journal more interesting than Cook's account. Cook's narrative is the work of a navigator: Banks's journal is the work of an alert scientific mind, eagerly on the watch to observe and to describe. Cook writes thus about the most exciting and hazardous incident of the voyage:

Our change of situation was now visible in every countenance, for it was most sensibly felt in every breast: we had been little less than three months entangled among shoals and rocks, that every moment threatened us with destruction; frequently passing our nights at anchor within hearing of the surge that broke over them; sometimes driving towards them even while our anchors were out, and knowing that if by any accident, to which an almost continuous tempest exposed us, they should not hold, we must in a few minutes inevitably perish. But now, after having sailed no less than 360 leagues, without once having a man out of the chains heaving the lead even for a minute, which perhaps never happened to any other vessel, we found ourselves in an open sea, with deep water; and enjoyed a flow of spirits which was equally owing to our late dangers and our present security: yet the very waves, which by their swell convinced us that we had no rocks or shoals to fear, convinced us also that we could not safely put the same confidence in our vessel as before she had struck.

Cook shows a more practised hand in the livelier and easier narrative of his second voyage *Towards the South Pole and round the World*; also, in the narrative of his third voyage *To the Pacific Ocean and for exploring the Northern Hemisphere*—a narrative cut short by the death of the great navigator at the hands of savages in the Sandwich islands.

George Vancouver, who had sailed under Cook, Rodney and Gardner, was sent upon a voyage of discovery to the north Pacific ocean (1791—5). His narrative, which was almost completed when he died in 1798, was published by his brother. It contains valuable and often picturesque observations on the countries visited and particularly on the Spanish settlements in California. He describes with warm sympathy the paternal relations between the Spanish missionaries and their Indian neophytes.

The literature of maritime discovery is continued in Arctic and Antarctic voyages accomplished and related by Franklin, Parry, John Ross, James Ross and McClintock. These narratives, carefully written and, for the most part, splendidly illustrated, have the attraction of resource, daring, endurance and brilliant achievement in strange and novel surroundings. The later records of Arctic and Antarctic exploration belong rather to the history of geography;

but mention must be made of captain Robert Falcon Scott's *Journal* (1913), a narrative in which the last entry was made by the dying hand of the writer as he sank under the buffets of storm and frost on his return journey from the south pole.

The records of land travel in the eighteenth century contain, generally, a less interesting story and less readable matter than the maritime records. The object of the writers is, usually, to impart information and observations laboriously collected. Sterne's *Sentimental Journey* is a notable exception, which stands apart. The prevailing dislike of mountains, of uncultivated lands and of Gothic buildings was unfavourable to the lighter and more sympathetic spirit of travel.

Pennant's books of travel in Great Britain were much read in his day. They are still valuable as antiquarian records and collections of observations; but they are rather in the nature of gazetteers, and the reader opens them for information, not for recreation. The characteristic travel-book of the eighteenth century is a ponderous quarto or folio, handsomely printed, often beautifully illustrated, and conveying much leisurely information concerning monuments, customs and costumes; but, as a rule, these productions have about them little of the personal spirit, little of the lighter literary touch which give vitality to travel-books. Richard Pococke, who was afterwards bishop of Ossory and was thence translated to Meath, was an eager student and observer, possessing something of the traveller's spirit; and his work, preserved in noble illustrated folios, is an interesting and valuable record. But his object was rather to give a description of Egypt and of western Asia than to entertain himself and his readers by recounting his experiences.

On the other hand, James Bruce, laird of Kinnaird, was a born traveller, endowed particularly with qualifications for eastern travel—an imposing stature and presence, great physical strength and athletic skill, strong self-confidence, a stubborn imperious determination, and a peculiar gift for mastering languages. Sir Richard Burton, a kindred spirit, repeatedly mentions 'the Lord of Geesh' with admiration. After long travel in Barbary and Syria, Bruce left Egypt in 1769 for Abyssinia, where he spent two years. He takes an engaging and open delight in his own prowess and reputation, in his feats of horsemanship and of shooting, in his appointment as one of the royal chamberlains and as governor of Geesh, in the king's gift 'a chain of 184 links, each link weighing 3 $\frac{1}{11}$  dwt. of fine gold,' in his friendship with the princess Ozoro

Esther, the most beautiful woman in Abyssinia, who once addressed him thus: 'Sit down there, Yagoube; God has exalted you above all in this country, when he has put it in your power, though but a stranger, to confer charity upon the king of it.' His vivid account of the hazardous overland journey from Abyssinia to Egypt is equal to the rest of the record. Of his departure, he writes:

Neither shall I take up the reader's time with a long narrative of leave-taking or what took place between me and those illustrious personages with whom I had lived so long in the most perfect and cordial friendship. Men of little and curious minds would perhaps think I was composing a panegyric upon myself, from which therefore I most willingly refrain.

The boast is not an empty one, for a British diplomatist, Henry Salt, visiting Abyssinia forty years later, speaks of Bruce's enduring renown in that country and of the extraordinary impression made upon the people by his noble personality.

A contemporary of Bruce, more famous in his day but of a less lasting fame, E. D. Clarke, was enabled to satisfy his passion for travel by a succession of tutorships. He had all the high spirit and zest of a true traveller, but these qualities appear not so much in his eleven volumes of *Travels in Europe, Asia and Africa*, as in his diaries and letters quoted in the biography of Clarke by his college friend bishop Otter. Clarke's eager curiosity leads him into multifarious and exciting risks, now viewing an eruption of Vesuvius, now surreptitiously visiting the sultan's seraglio in Stamboul, now pushing his way, in an English uniform, through a fanatical Neapolitan crowd to view the miracle of saint Januarius. At Brixen 'Saw a cabinet of Natural History, extensive and full of trash.' At Vienna, beheld 'the best clown I ever saw.'

Clarke, through his presence at Alexandria in 1801 when the French army evacuated Egypt, did much to obtain for England the Egyptian antiquities and documents collected by the French *savants*. To the university of Cambridge, he made valuable gifts. In 1808, he became the first professor of mineralogy, and, nine years later, he was appointed university librarian. He sold his collection of manuscripts to the Bodleian for £1000, and cleared nearly £7000 by the publication of his travels.

Clarke's friend and correspondent, J. L. Burckhardt, a Swiss by birth, but by adoption a Cambridge man and, in some sort, an Englishman, won an enduring reputation by his extensive travels in Asia and Africa and by his faithful descriptions of oriental life. 'During all my journeys in the East,' he writes, 'I never enjoyed

such perfect ease as at Mecca.' And Belzoni, the explorer of the pyramids, writes, 'What shall I say of the late Sheik Burckhardt, who was so well acquainted with the language and manners of these people that none of them suspected him to be an European.' Meantime, the farthest east found an observer in Sir John Barrow, who accompanied lord Macartney in the first British embassy to China in 1792. But the reader should turn, not to Barrow's formidable quarto volumes *Travels in China* and *A Voyage to Cochinchina*, but to his *Auto-biographical Memoir*, published half-a-century later. He thus describes the ambassador's entry into Peking:

A multitude of moveable workshops of tinkers and barbers, of cobblers and blacksmiths, together with tents and booths, where tea and rice and fruit with various kinds of eatables were to be sold, had contracted the street, spacious as it was, to a narrow road in the middle, scarcely wide enough to allow two little carts to pass each other: yet within this narrow space were processions bearing umbrellas, flags and painted lanterns—trains carrying corpses to their graves with lamentable cries—others with squeaking music conducting brides to their husbands—troops of dromedaries laden with coals from Tartary—wheelbarrows and handcarts stuffed with vegetables; and if to these be added numbers of pedlers with their packs, jugglers and conjurers and fortune-tellers, musicians and comedians, mountebanks and quack-doctors—with all these impediments, so little room was left for the persons of the embassy that it was nearly three hours before we reached the north-western gate.

Sir John Barrow was for forty years under-secretary to the admiralty, and distinguished himself as an enthusiastic supporter, and, also, as historian, of Arctic exploration. The tale of oriental travel is continued by Sir John Malcolm, who published anonymously an account of his second journey to Persia in 1810 as envoy to the shah from the East India company. He observes characters and renders eastern tales with much humour and insight. The delightful stories of Abdullah the peasant and of Ahmed the cobbler will bear the test of reading aloud.

The 'romantic revival,' which transformed poetry and fiction, made itself gradually felt in the literature of travel also. It is true that solid and formal records, such as are characteristic of the eighteenth century, continued to appear down to about 1825. But narratives of a more natural and easy flow were already beginning to take their place. Sir Leslie Stephen, in an admirably humorous piece of criticism (chapter II of *The play-ground of Europe*) attributes, in part at least, the modern taste for mountains and rugged scenery to the influence of Rousseau and

his followers. On the other hand, Byron urges that natural scenery does not, in itself, furnish an adequate topic for the poet.

I have seen as many mountains as most men and more fleets than the generality of landsmen, and to my mind a large convoy with a few sail-of-the-line to conduct them is as noble and poetical a prospect as all that inanimate nature can produce.

And he applies to poetry Pope's dictum: 'The proper study of mankind is man.' Byron's own poetical book of travels, *Childe Harold*, had borne out this observation. What Byron says of poetry may be applied to literature generally; and the better travel-books of the nineteenth century respond to this test. They deal less with monuments, museums, churches and institutions: they deal more with men and women in relation to their surroundings. Sometimes, this human interest lies in the pleasant egotism of the traveller, sometimes in his observations on those among whom he moves. The change of tone appears notably, if not actually first, in works by naturalists, impelled to travel by scientific motives. Alexander von Humboldt's narrative of travels in tropical South America, translated into English in 1814—21, deeply influenced later observers and travellers. In 1825 appeared Waterton's *Wanderings in South America*, a most entertaining and vivacious record of adventurous and unconventional travel. Charles Waterton was a Yorkshire squire of an ancient Roman catholic family, educated at Stonyhurst, a keen sportsman and enthusiastic naturalist, also a devoted reader of *Don Quixote*, of the Latin poets and of English literature. He spent eight years managing an estate in Guiana, and, afterwards, made four journeys of observation in the Orinoco region, between 1812 and 1824. His account of his ride on a crocodile is classical:

It was the first and last time I ever was on a cayman's back. Should it be asked how I managed to keep my seat, I would answer,—I hunted some years with Lord Darlington's foxhounds.

But one may open the book on any page to be entertained by vivid and humorous descriptions. Waterton afterwards turned his Yorkshire park into a kind of preserve or museum of living creatures. At the age of eighty-three, he was still climbing the tallest forest trees and rising daily at 3 a.m.

The war of South American independence and the accompanying political revolution produced a number of descriptions of travels in that continent. Among them, the journal of captain Basil Hall, of the royal navy, has a deserved reputation. Sir Francis Head's account of his rides across the Pampa, published in 1826,

gives a vivid, rapid and faithful sketch of Gaucho life and character. It was received at the time with general incredulity, which, in itself, is sufficient proof of widespread interest. But, among narratives of South American travel Darwin's account of the voyage of the 'Beagle' is pre-eminent, not only by virtue of its place in the history of science, but, also, by virtue of its qualities as a picturesque and readable record of travel.

In 1848, nine years after the publication of Darwin's first work, Alfred Russel Wallace sailed to Brazil, where he spent four years in the scientific exploration of the Amazonian region. His book fully justifies its frequent reimpressions as a record of travel, apart from its scientific value. The ship in which Wallace was returning home caught fire at sea. Her people took to the boats and were picked up by a passing vessel. Wallace's collections were all lost. The event is admirably described by Wallace himself. Yet more interesting and better written than his Amazonian narrative is his work on the Malay archipelago (1869), an account of eight years of residence and travel in the East Indies—straightforward, unaffected and entertaining.

About the middle of the nineteenth century, readable books of travel multiply with increasing facilities for travel. First among them should be mentioned a work designed for the use of travellers, Richard Ford's *Handbook for travellers in Spain* (1845). By intimate association with Spaniards and by travel on horseback over their mountains and plains, Ford had obtained a singularly close and sympathetic insight into the ways of the people, besides an intimate knowledge of their country. Sitting in an armchair at home, one may enjoy travel in Spain and intercourse with Spaniards by turning the pages anywhere. The constant allusions to the episodes of the Peninsular war—which was recent history at that time—add greatly to the interest of the book; but its principal charm lies in Ford's vein of easy conversational comment and anecdote, illustrated by constant quotation of Spanish proverbial sayings and local idioms. Ford's work gains a certain piquancy from the tinge of satire which pervades it. Although fundamentally full of intimate sympathy for Spain and for Spaniards, nevertheless he writes with a certain assumption of insularity, from the slightly fastidious standpoint of an English gentleman—an attitude which is in pleasant contrast with his familiar knowledge of the jests and idioms of street-corner and tavern. A contemporary book, *The Bible in Spain* (1843)<sup>1</sup>, by Ford's friend

<sup>1</sup> See, *ante*, chap. III.

Borrow, a work of extraordinary freshness, possessing a singular indescribable quality of its own, is, in some sort, complementary to Ford's work. Borrow writes as a wanderer, as the friend and companion of gypsies, vagabonds and thieves. The two writers together supply a picture of Spain such as can scarcely be found in Spanish literature outside the pages of *Don Quixote*. They make the reader feel that, in a sense, the Pyrenees are the boundary of Europe, that Spain is, as it were, a detached fragment of the orient, Christian, but not wholly European—a country whose attraction lies in its contrast of rocky wilderness and teeming garden, of natural wealth and contented poverty, in the simplicity and dignity of its life, in the primitive brutality or beauty of its impulses, in its pleasant oriental courtesies.

It is, therefore, a natural transition to books on the east, books which are not so much narratives of discovery as impressions of a world different from ours and only half revealed. In 1844 appeared two Eastern narratives, *The Crescent and the Cross* by Eliot Warburton, an Irish barrister, and *Eothen* by his college friend Kinglake, of the English bar, afterwards historian of the Crimean war. Warburton's spirited and picturesque narrative had the greater success at the time. The tenth impression appeared within nine years, just after the author's premature death; for Warburton perished in the 'Amazon,' burnt at sea in 1852 on the way to the West Indies. But Warburton's book, with its slightly melodramatic and self-conscious tone, cannot be compared with the fine literary and scholarly quality of *Eothen*, which still holds its ground as a classic, and is, perhaps, the best book of travel in the English language. Kinglake rode from Belgrade to Constantinople, thence to Smyrna, by sea to Cyprus and Beyrout, whence he rode through Palestine and across the desert to Cairo—where he vividly describes the plague—then from Cairo to Damascus and Anatolia. From his saddle, he looks about him with something of that aristocratic aloofness which has been already noticed in Richard Ford, but, also, with something of the same scholarly and wellbred insight and sympathy. He carries with him through the desert a trace of the atmosphere of Eton, Trinity, Lincoln's inn and the hunting-field. The terms on which the eastern and Latin churches live at Jerusalem remind him of 'the peculiar relations subsisting at Cambridge between town and gown.' He travelled at ease, accompanied by a little cavalcade—servant, interpreter, guide, escort. At every halt, his baggage is unstrapped and his tent is set out 'with books and maps and

fragrant tea.' 'A speck in the broad tracts of Asia remained still impressed with the mark of patent portmantcaus and the heels of London boots.' The most famous passage in *Eothen* is the imaginary conversation between a pasha and an English traveller. But some will prefer the fourth chapter, where, full of Homeric memories, Kinglake wanders through the Troad, and recalls his debt to his mother: 'She could teach him in earliest childhood no less than this, to find a home in his saddle, and to love old Homer, and all that old Homer sung.' Throughout the whole book one travels in good company.

The same is true of *The Monasteries of the Levant* by Robert Curzon, afterwards lord Zouche. Between 1834 and 1837, Curzon visited Egypt, Syria, Albania and mount Athos, in order to examine and collect ancient manuscripts. A dozen years later, sitting among these books, he entertained his solitary evenings in an English country house by writing

some account of the most curious of these MSS and the places in which they were found, as well as some of the adventures which I encountered in the pursuit of my venerable game.

The result was a charming flow of reminiscence, the expression of an engaging personality. His account of Egypt under Mehemet Ali has distinct historical value; and, in chapter xvi, he describes, as an eye-witness, the shocking scene of confusion, panic and death which took place in the church of the Holy Sepulchre on the occasion when Ibrahim pasha was present at the Easter ceremony of the holy fire. In a pleasanter and lighter vein, Curzon relates with a certain quaint simplicity his odd experiences in remote monasteries.

But Sir Richard Burton stands first among eastern travellers. A man of cosmopolitan education and tastes, soldier, linguist, oriental scholar, he has recorded the strenuous activities of his crowded life in many volumes recounting travels in Asia, Africa and South America. In 1853, Burton, disguised as an Afghan physician and assuming the name Mirza Abdullah, made the pilgrimage to Mecca and Medina, sharing all the experiences of his Moslem companions. His record of these experiences may be best described in the words of another oriental scholar, Stanley Lane Poole:

The pilgrimage to the Holy Cities of Islam records the most famous adventure of one of the boldest explorers of the century:—its vivid descriptions, its pungent uncompromising style, its intense personal note distinguish it broadly from the common run of books of travel; and the picture it gives of Arab life and manners, the insight it reveals in Semitic ideas give it a



permanent value as a national record, as true today as half a century ago, and as true then as a thousand years before. Dashed off in Burton's rapid impulsive way, the book is the strangest compound of Oriental learning, a grim sardonic humour, and an insobriety of opinion expressed in the writer's vigorous vernacular.

A more quiet and leisurely, but equally intimate picture, of eastern life is found in *A year's journey through Central and Eastern Arabia in 1862*—3 by William Gifford Palgrave, who, first as an officer in the Indian army and, afterwards, as a Jesuit missionary priest, had won so close an intimacy with eastern ways and tongues that he was able to live among the Wahabees of Arabia in the character of a Syrian doctor, in order to investigate the possibility of Christian propaganda in that region. His book, which bears no trace of this missionary purpose, is a pleasant picture of daily life and of intercourse with his Arab neighbours. Palgrave's varied career finally led him into the British diplomatic service.

An eastern travel-book of equal interest though of quite a different stamp is *A Popular account of discoveries at Nineveh* (1851) by Austen Henry Layard, who, also, was a restlessly energetic eastern wanderer of cosmopolitan tastes and habits. More picturesque, even, than the description of the finding of the great sculptured man-lion is the account of the removal of the colossal man-bull by a crowd of yelling Arab workmen 'half-frantic with excitement.' In his old age, after a varied diplomatic and parliamentary career, Sir Henry Layard wrote a charming account of *Early Adventures in Persia, Susiana and Babylonia*. Among literary works of eastern travel, William Hepworth Dixon's two works on Palestine and on Cyprus also claim mention.

The exploration of Africa during the nineteenth century produced a multitude of volumes, recording much heroic effort and achievement. David Livingstone must come first. His two books contain the plain straightforward story of a strenuous many-sided life entirely devoted to missionary work and scientific observation in south Africa. Their pages do not much lend themselves to telling quotation: they are clear, well written records, recalling, in a manner, the maritime diaries or narratives of the later eighteenth century. And, in general, this is true of other works concerning African travel. Most of them are more notable for what they relate than for their manner of relating it. Burton's *The Lake Regions of Central Africa*, expresses the virile and aggressive personality of that untiring traveller. Speke's *Journal of the discovery of the source of the Nile*, a fine record of

exploration, is, perhaps, best in a literary sense where he describes the court of 'Mtesa, king of Uganda:

I was now requested to shoot the four cows as quickly as possible. I borrowed the revolving pistol I had given him and shot all four in a second of time. . . . The king now loaded one of the carbines I had given him with his own hands, and giving it full cock to a page, told him to go out and shoot a man in the outer court; which was no sooner accomplished than the little urchin returned to announce his success with a look of glee such as one would see in the face of a boy who had robbed a bird's nest, caught a trout, or done any other boyish trick. The king said to him, 'And did you do it well?' 'Oh yes, capitally.' He spoke the truth, no doubt, for he dared not have trifled with the king; but the affair created hardly any interest.

Travel in tropical west Africa is a lurid tale of barbaric negro states, of slave-hunting and human sacrifice, of monstrous animals and pestiferous swamps, of mysterious rivers and dangerous forests, of trading and carousing in the midst of pestilence and death, of explorers devoting health and life to their zeal for observation and for science. Among those whose lives were sacrificed to their passion for west African travel there are two whose literary power raises their books above the rest. These are W. Winwood Reade and Mary Kingsley. Reade, a nephew of the novelist, was himself a man of literary power and promise who gave his fortune and life to west Africa. His *African Sketch-book*, a charming record of three journeys, appeared in 1873. Not long after its publication, its writer died from the effects of his share in the Ashantee campaign. Mary Kingsley, whose father and two uncles were all notable voyagers and authors, travelled for scientific observation. In 1900 she died at Simon's Town of enteric fever, caught in tending Boer prisoners. Her *Travels in West Africa*, though marred in parts by overlaboured humour, is very good at its best:

On first entering the great grim twilight regions of the forest, you hardly see anything but the vast column-like grey tree stems in their countless thousands around you, and the sparsely vegetated ground beneath. But day by day, as you get trained to your surroundings, you see more and more, and a whole world grows up gradually out of the gloom before your eyes. . . . Nor indeed do I recommend African forest life to anyone. Unless you are interested in it and fall under its charm, it is the most awful life in death imaginable. And if you do fall under its spell, it takes the colour out of other kinds of living.

One kind of travel, namely Alpine climbing, has produced a copious modern literature—peculiarly British in character—which scarcely goes farther back than the middle of the nineteenth century. *Peaks, passes and glaciers*, a series of episodes described by different writers, appeared in 1859. *The play-ground of Europe* by Sir Leslie Stephen is marked by a peculiar literary

distinction. Whympers' books on the Alps and on the Andes provide plenty of exciting matter. Alpine writing, including the works of living writers and also the pages of *The Alpine Journal*, is generally of good literary quality, being largely the work of accomplished men whose recreation is Alpine climbing.

The growth of the British oversea dominions has produced many books of travel. Conspicuous among them are Sir Charles Dilke's two books *Greater Britain* (1868) and *Problems of Greater Britain* (1890) which contain the observations of two journeys in America and the Antipodes. They are notable both for their lucid, easy mode of expression, and still more for their political insight and clear perception of immediate difficulties and of future possibilities—possibilities which have since, in great part, been realised.

Only actual books of travel have here been mentioned. It would pass the scope of this chapter to do more than hint at the influence of these books and of personal travelling reminiscences upon English poetry and prose fiction. Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe*, Swift's *Gulliver's Travels*, Coleridge's *Ancient Mariner*, Michael Scott's *Tom Cringle's Log*, Charles Kingsley's *Westward Ho!*, Charles Reade's *The Cloister and the Hearth*, R. L. Stevenson's *Treasure Island*, are typical examples, and the list might be endlessly extended. Every poet of the nineteenth century, from Wordsworth to Tennyson and Browning, has left upon his pages some impression of his travels. From Fielding to Stevenson one may dip into the novelists almost at random to find sketches of travel. The first chapter of *Guy Mannering* is a vivid picture of a Scottish journey. *Tom Jones* and *Humphrey Clinker* take us along the country roads of England. *Vanity Fair* gives a picture of continental travel before the days of railways: *Pickwick* is fresh with the more homely humours of the English roadside and coaching inn. Upon another plane, Charles Lever's wanderings inspire his pen. Later literature abounds with smaller books of the same family—fictitious or half-fictitious stories of trips on foot or bicycle, in canoe or caravan, at home and abroad.

One other reflection occurs. Although the literature of travel is not the highest kind, and, indeed, cannot be called a distinct branch, of literature, yet a history of English literature rightly assigns a space apart to such books, because this kind of writing, perhaps more than any other, both expresses and influences national predilections and national character. In view of the

magnificent achievements and splendid records of other nations who have preceded or accompanied the British in the fields of travel and discovery, it would be most inappropriate to attempt any kind of national comparison. But books of travel and books inspired by travel have, probably, been more read in Great Britain than any other books except novels. The educational value of pleasant travel-books is great. They have provided the substance of a thousand books for boys; and thus, both directly and indirectly, have guided and fired the inclinations of many generations of boys. And every reader, whether boy or man, finds in his favourite books of travel some image of himself and some hint towards moulding himself.

## CHAPTER VIII

### THE LITERATURE OF SCIENCE

#### A. PHYSICS AND MATHEMATICS

THE brilliant achievements of British mathematicians, astronomers and physicists under the influence of Isaac Newton were followed by a long period of comparative inactivity. This was largely due to the fact that, during a considerable part of the eighteenth century, members of the British school were, more or less, out of touch with their continental contemporaries. A free exchange of views is essential to vigour and, the more varied the outlook and training of those concerned, the more fruitful is the intercourse. The effect of this isolation, moreover, was intensified by the manner in which English writers strove in their demonstrations to follow Newtonian forms. If Newton, in his *Principia*, confined himself to geometrical proofs, it was because their validity was unimpeachable; and, since his results were novel, he did not wish the discussion as to their truth to turn on the methods used to demonstrate them. But his followers, long after the principles of the calculus had been accepted, continued to employ geometrical proofs, whenever it was possible, even when these did not offer the simplest and most direct way of arriving at the result.

In short, we may say that, in the course of English mathematical science, the last seventy years of the eighteenth century form a sort of isolated backwater; for this reason, it is unnecessary here to describe in detail the work of the writers of this period. We must not, however, fall into the error of thinking that, among them, there were no men of ability. The investigations of Colin Maclaurin, of Edinburgh, on attractions, are excellent, and his treatise on fluxions is, perhaps, the best exposition of that method of analysis. We may also refer to the work of Thomas Simpson, of London, on the figure of the earth, tides and various astronomical problems; of John Michell, of Cambridge, who determined the law of force between magnetic poles, invented the torsion

balance and devised the plan of determining the density of the earth carried out by Cavendish in 1798; of Henry Cavendish<sup>1</sup>, who discovered the law of attraction in static electricity, introduced the ideas of electrostatic capacity and specific inductive capacity and determined the density of the earth by his wellknown experiments; and of Joseph Priestley<sup>1</sup>, who also discovered, independently of others, the law of attraction in electrostatics and the existence of oxygen; while, in observational astronomy, we need only refer to the great achievements of James Bradley and (Sir) William Herschel. In applications of science, this period and the early years of the nineteenth century were notable for the development of the steam-engine. Somewhat earlier, Thomas Savery and Thomas Newcomen had done much to bring it into practical use; but modern forms may be said to date from the improvements introduced by James Watt, Richard Trevithick and Henry Bell.

With the nineteenth century, a new era in the history of mathematics and theoretical physics in Great Britain opened. We shall deal here only with its main features, and, so far as possible, shall avoid technical details. Unfortunately, limits of space forbid the introduction of those biographical touches which would have added to the human interest of the story we have to tell.

The first thirty or thirty-five years of this period were largely occupied with work preparatory to the outburst of activity that characterised the Victorian renaissance. Early in the nineteenth century, the use of analytical methods was introduced in the Cambridge mathematical curriculum. The advocacy of this change, originated by Robert Woodhouse, was warmly taken up by George Peacock, Charles Babbage, (Sir) John Herschel, William Whewell and (Sir) George Airy. These men worked under the influence of the great French school, of which Lagrange and Laplace are the most prominent members, and were hardly affected by their contemporaries, such as Gauss, Abel and Jacobi, who were then creating new branches of pure mathematics. In England, at the beginning of the century, Cambridge was recognised as the principal mathematical school: all the reformers were residents there, and they directed their efforts mainly to the introduction of a free use of analysis in the university course of study. They were successful; and, by 1830, the fluxional and geometrical methods of the eighteenth century had fallen into disuse. The leadership

<sup>1</sup> See section 2 of the present chapter.

of Cambridge in this change was undisputed, and the employment of analytical methods became usual throughout Great Britain.

In these years, a good deal of interesting work in physics and chemistry was done in London, where the Royal Institution in its laboratories offered far better opportunities for research than any similar body in Britain. In connection with this society, we may mention the work of Thomas Young, whose investigations on wave motion prepared the way for the acceptance of the undulatory theory of light, and we may associate with him the names of (Count) Rumford and (Sir) David Brewster; optics and heat being the subjects to which their especial attention was directed. At the same time, John Dalton<sup>1</sup>, in Manchester, was studying the expansion of gases under varying changes of pressure and temperature, and the tension of vapours.

At this time, interest in natural philosophy was widely disseminated, and, in science, as in politics and literature, new ideas were readily welcomed. Institutes and scientific societies were founded everywhere, and popular lectures by experts spread broadcast general, though somewhat vague, information on natural philosophy and astronomy. The year 1831 is memorable for the foundation of the British Association for the Advancement of Science. The intention of its promoters was that the Association should meet every year for a few days at a provincial town under a distinguished president, with the object, partly, of encouraging personal intercourse between leading men of science and, partly, of promoting interest in scientific work in the various localities where meetings were held. The meetings led to the regular appointment of expert committees instructed to report on the progress in various subjects; these reports have been, and are, of permanent value.

By way of addition to this preliminary statement, we may also, in passing, mention the *History of the Inductive Sciences*, published by Whewell in 1837. It put together in a readable form the leading facts connected with the history and growth of science, and, though open to criticism on questions of details—as was inevitable in the case of an encyclopaedic work of the kind—it served a useful purpose. Hardly less important was *The Penny Cyclopaedia*, issued in twenty-seven volumes in 1833—43 with three supplements.

The most notable physicist at the beginning of the Victorian period was Michael Faraday<sup>1</sup>, who, in 1831, had begun those investigations on electricity which have altered our conceptions

<sup>1</sup> See section 2 of the present chapter.

of the subject, and, by their applications, have revolutionised industrial science. Faraday had been brought up in humble circumstances, and his career is interesting as an illustration of the fact that, in England, no door is closed to genius. In 1812, after attending some lectures delivered by Sir Humphry Davy, he sent notes of them to Davy, asking his assistance to enable him to study science. The result was that Davy employed him as an assistant in the chemical laboratory in the Royal Institution. Here, Faraday's experimental skill soon led to appreciation of his powers, and he wrote various papers on scientific questions.

Faraday's earliest electrical work related to induced currents, and depended on his discovery of the fact that, if a wire in the shape of a closed curve is moved to or from another wire through which an electric current is flowing, a current is set up in the former wire which ceases so soon as the motion ceases. The induced current is caused by and depends on the motion of the one wire relative to the other. Magnetic effects can be similarly produced. Faraday went on to explain various phenomena by the action of the induced currents which he had discovered. As he pondered on possible explanations of these results, it occurred to him that all space might be filled by lines of magnetic force, every line being a closed curve passing through the magnet to which it belongs; and he pointed out that the existence of these lines was suggested by the familiar experiment of the arrangement of iron filings in such lines about a magnet from whose poles they radiate. According to this view, these induced currents were caused by the closed wire (or any conductor) being moved across lines of force in its plane of motion, and, if so, the electromotive force of an induced current would be proportional to the number of unit lines of magnetic force cut in a second by the moving wire. Now, the earth itself may be regarded as a gigantic magnet, and, hence, if a copper wire spin across the earth's lines of force, we should expect currents to be produced. This was found to be the case. By these experiments, Faraday tapped vast and hitherto unknown sources of electricity. The use of dynamos as a source of mechanical power resulted from these discoveries.

These investigations were followed by experiments to show the identity in kind of electrical currents, however produced. His investigations on electrolysis attracted general attention to the subject, and led him to the remarkable conclusion that there is a certain absolute quantity of electricity associated with each



atom of matter. A few years later, in 1845, he discovered another remarkable series of phenomena dependent on the fact that the plane of polarisation of light can be rotated by the action of magnets and electric currents; and, somewhat later, he discovered and investigated diamagnetic properties in bodies.

The provision of well equipped laboratories is a modern luxury, and Faraday was exceptionally fortunate in having access to one. It is difficult to overrate his abilities as an experimental philosopher; and, though he knew but little mathematics, his conception of lines of force was essentially mathematical, and was developed later by Clerk Maxwell and other writers. At the time, however, it repelled mathematicians accustomed to the formulae and symbols with which Laplace and Poisson had made them familiar. It is interesting to see that Faraday, like Newton, refused to contemplate the possibility of action at a distance, but sought, rather, to explain the phenomena of attraction by changes in a continuous medium. He was followed at the Royal Institution by John Tyndall, whose lectures did much to excite and maintain general interest in physical questions.

While Faraday was opening new ways of regarding physical phenomena, the classical methods of Poisson were being applied with success by James MacCullagh, of Dublin, to problems of physical optics. In these investigations, MacCullagh, like his continental contemporaries, elaborated the conception of the ether as an elastic solid, and, thence, he deduced the laws of reflection and refraction; but, though his work was ingenious, many of his conclusions were vitiated by his erroneous assumption that the vibrations of plane polarised light are parallel to the plane of polarisation. Another physicist of this time whose work has been of importance was James Prescott Joule, a pupil of Dalton, who showed that heat and energy were interchangeable in definite proportions. Mention should also be made of (Sir) Charles Wheatstone, who, about 1840, brought electric telegraphy into general use. Wheatstone was a man of wide interests: he early suggested the use of spectrum analysis for chemical researches invented stereoscopic instruments and, later, did much useful work in the construction of dynamos.

This period was rich in inventions whereby science was applied practically, as, for example, the general employment of steam-engines for locomotion, the electric telegraph and the introduction of lighting and heating by gas.

We turn from these practical applications to consider more

abstract researches. Faraday was recognised as an 'exceptional genius, and time has strengthened the recognition of his claim to distinction ; but, in general, theoretical physics had, by now, become so closely connected with mathematics that it seemed hardly possible for anyone without mathematical knowledge to make further advances in its problems. This association lasted well into the twentieth century, and the continuation and extension of Faraday's work fell into the hands of mathematicians.

Before proceeding to describe the remarkable work of the school of mathematical physicists who followed Faraday, it will be convenient to mention the leading writers of this time on pure mathematics. We may begin by noting the fact that the range of pure mathematics had, ere this, grown to an extent which rendered it difficult for any man to master more than a comparatively small section of it, and, *a fortiori*, physicists took up only such special branches of mathematics as were required for their own purposes. We should also notice that one of the striking features of this period has been the largely increased number of students of mathematical and physical science : hence, to mention only the leading writers does indirect injustice to others whose work, though not epoch-making, has been of real importance. With this caution, we proceed to name a few of those whose researches have permanently affected the development of mathematics.

In the period on which we are now entering, we find half-a-dozen mathematicians—De Morgan, Hamilton, Sylvester, Adams, Cayley and Smith—whose researches will always make it memorable. Hamilton and Smith were fastidious writers, and, apart from the value of their work, it is a pleasure to observe the artistic manner in which they presented it ; but their pupils were few, and it was only to a select number of scholars that their writings appealed. The others were more fortunate in being connected with the great mathematical school of Cambridge. Their methods are sharply contrasted. De Morgan wrote vivaciously, and largely for non-specialists. Cayley's writings were precise and methodical, and he always sought to be exhaustive. Sylvester's papers, like his lectures, were badly constructed, impetuous and often unfinished ; yet, experience proved them to be amazingly stimulating. Adams's work was elegant and highly polished. Modern pure mathematics deals so largely with abstract and special subjects that it is almost impossible to describe the conclusions in a way intelligible to laymen. It will suffice to indicate the subjects of their principal researches.

Of these mathematicians, Augustus De Morgan was the oldest. He was educated at Cambridge, but, at that time, office in the university was conditional on certain declarations of religious belief. In consequence of this, he moved to London, and there, through his writings and lectures, exercised wide influence. He was well read in the philosophy and history of mathematics; but it is on the general influence he exerted rather than on discoveries of his own that his reputation rests. With his name we may associate that of George Boole, of Cork, the creator of certain branches of symbolic logic, whose mathematical works are enriched by discussions on the fundamental principles of the subject. His writings are valuable in themselves, and their presentment of conclusions is lucid and interesting.

(Sir) William Rowan Hamilton was among the first of a small but brilliant school of mathematicians connected with Trinity college, Dublin, where he spent his life. We regard his papers on optics and dynamics as specially characteristic of his clearness of exposition: theoretical dynamics being properly treated as a branch of pure mathematics. He is, however, best known by his introduction, in 1852, of quaternions as a method of analysis. Hamilton, followed, later, by authorities so good as P. G. Tait of Cambridge and Edinburgh, A. Macfarlane of Edinburgh and Pennsylvania and C. J. Joly of Dublin, asserted that this would be found to be a potent instrument of research; but, as a matter of fact, though it lends itself to concise and elegant demonstrations, it is but little used by mathematicians today. In connection with Dublin, at this time, we must also mention the name of George Salmon, provost of Trinity college, whose works on analytical geometry and higher algebra are classical examples of how advanced text-books should be written, and that of (Sir) Robert Stawell Ball, first, of Dublin and, later, of Cambridge, who produced a classical treatise on the theory of screws.

James Joseph Sylvester, like De Morgan, found an academic life at Cambridge denied him in consequence of his theological tenets; but the subsequent abolition of religious tests at the older universities enabled him, towards the end of his life, to accept a chair at Oxford. He was a prolific writer; perhaps his favourite studies were the theory of numbers and higher algebra; in the latter subject, he dealt especially with canonical forms, contravariants and reciprocants. The lectures that he gave at Baltimore, from 1877 to 1883, did much to stimulate interest in pure mathematics in America.

John Couch Adams was another graduate of Cambridge, and spent all his life in that university. There are three important questions in theoretical astronomy, treated as a branch of pure mathematics, which are especially connected with his name. The first of these is his discovery, in 1846, of the planet Neptune, through the disturbance caused by it in the orbit of Uranus; this was made independently of, and a few months earlier than, the similar investigation by Leverrier. This finding of an unsuspected and unseen planet afforded a striking demonstration of the universality of gravitation, and excited widespread admiration. The second of these famous investigations is to be found in Adams's discussion, published in 1855, of the secular acceleration of the moon's mean motion—a difficult problem, involving heavy analytical work and elaborate historical enquiries. The third is his determination, in 1867, of the orbit of the Leonid shooting stars.

Arthur Cayley, likewise, spent the bulk of his life at Cambridge, first as a student and then as a professor. He discussed many subjects in pure mathematics, his most notable researches dealing with the general theory of curves and surfaces in analytical geometry, with the theory of invariants in higher algebra, and, in ten classical memoirs, with binary and ternary forms. He also wrote at length on elliptic functions, but treated it from Jacobi's point of view; and, in consequence of Weierstrass's work, much of this is out of date.

Henry John Stephen Smith, who was educated at the sister university of Oxford, will be long remembered for his work on the theory of numbers, especially on linear determinate equations, and the orders and genera of ternary quadratic forms. He was a graceful lecturer and writer; but, while the value of his researches was recognised, he founded no school. His paper on the representation of numbers by sums of four, six, eight, five and seven squares was the occasion of a curious incident, which illustrates, incidentally, the widespread ignorance of his work. Fourteen years after it had been published in the *Proceedings of the Royal Society*, the problem, for the single case of five squares, was proposed by the French Academy as a subject for its grand prize, open to the world. The problem had, in fact, years before, been completely solved by Smith, who, to secure the reward had only to write out his demonstration for the special case proposed.

We have already briefly described Adams's investigations in mathematical astronomy, and, perhaps, we may here add a word

or two on the researches of (Sir) George Howard Darwin, also of Cambridge, who investigated the form taken by a rotating viscous mass of matter, and showed that, in the early history of the solar system, the moon arose from a portion of the earth thrown off (when the latter was in a plastic condition) through its increasing velocity of rotation. Later, he demonstrated that the moons of the other planets could not have originated in the same way. He wrote at length on the theory of tides. He also worked at the problem of three bodies, investigating, by lengthy arithmetical methods, possible stable forms of periodic orbits of one body, moving under the attraction of two other bodies.

With observational and practical astronomy we are not here concerned; but we may add that the results of the astronomical discoveries of the Victorian period were made familiar to the English speaking world by the popular treatises and lectures of Sir Robert S. Ball whom we have already mentioned, and by various works by Miss A. M. Clerke.

Mention may here be made, also, of two great teachers of the Victorian age, to wit, William Hopkins, and Edward John Routh, under whom many generations of Cambridge mathematicians were educated, and to whom the predominance in Britain, throughout the period here treated, of the mathematical school of that university is largely due. Of more recent English writers on pure mathematics, some have devoted themselves to higher analysis, especially differential equations, differential geometry and the theory of functions; others have followed continental initiative in discussing the fundamental principles and philosophy of mathematics.

We return to the subject of theoretical physics. It was the good fortune of the Cambridge school to produce, in the Victorian period, some of the greatest physicists of the century. The university course for a degree, at that time, involved a study of the elements of nearly all the branches of mathematics then read; and, thus, its graduates were exceptionally well equipped for discussing physical problems from the mathematical side. Among these physicists, we here mention briefly the work of George Green, (Sir) George Stokes, (Sir) William Thomson afterwards lord Kelvin, and Clerk Maxwell. To their credit, be it said, they all treated symbols and formulae as servants and not as ends in themselves.

George Green was a self-educated man, who came to Cambridge in middle life and took his degree in 1837, unfortunately for science dying four years later. In 1828, he introduced the idea of the potential, representing the work which must be done to move a

unit of mass from infinity to its position. In this memoir is established the celebrated formula, connecting surface and volume integrals, which forms a fundamental proposition in the theory of attractions. Green wrote on various physical questions, notably on the motion of waves in a canal, and the deduction of the geometrical laws of sound and light from the undulatory theory. In these writings, he showed remarkable physical insight in the applications of his analysis. His memoirs on the propagation of light in a crystalline medium, published in 1839, rest on the assumption that the ether in a crystal resembles an elastic solid unequally pressed in different directions by unmoved ponderable matter—a conception which, later, was to lead to remarkable developments. Few writings have been more fruitful than those of Green. They led MacCullagh and Cauchy to revise their theories of optics, and they profoundly impressed Stokes and Kelvin, whose work we now proceed to describe.

(Sir) George Gabriel Stokes spent his life at Cambridge, where he held the Lucasian chair for over half a century. Through his long tenure of the secretaryship of the Royal society, he acted as the friend and guide of innumerable young authors, for, by virtue of his office, he saw the manuscripts of all papers on mathematics and physics, and freely placed at the disposal of the writers his unrivalled knowledge of physics and mathematics: thus, a considerable proportion of his work appears under the names of other writers. He began his scientific career under the influence of Green's writings. It is difficult to describe his researches in general terms. The most important of them are concerned with optics, hydrodynamics and geodesy. In optics, he was mainly responsible for the explanation of fluorescence, and only just missed being the first to propound the true explanation of Fraunhofer's lines; he subjected diffraction to mathematical analysis; in hydrodynamics, we owe to him the modern theory of viscous fluids, and he wrote on the properties and constitution of the ether. His work in pure mathematics, especially on the convergence of series, was also of importance. Stokes was an excellent man of affairs—he sat for a time in the house of commons—but his gift of silence prevented his exercising among strangers the full influence which his abilities deserved. He was the intimate friend of Kelvin and Maxwell, and to his deliberate judgment on scientific matters Kelvin always yielded.

(Sir) William Thomson, later raised to the peerage under the title baron Kelvin, was another graduate of Cambridge of this

period. (To avoid the confusion of the use of two names we will here refer to him as Kelvin.) In 1846, the year following on his first degree, he accepted a professorial chair at Glasgow, but he always kept in touch with his mathematical friends in Cambridge. Probably, he exercised a wider influence in the world at large than any of his scientific contemporaries ; but his interests were so catholic that it is not easy to give any connected account of them. He possessed an almost intuitive power of realising fundamental principles. Throughout his life, ideas seem to have come to him so rapidly as to give him insufficient time for their effective development ; hence, the student will search in vain among his papers for complete and systematic expositions of his discoveries.

He began his career under the influence of Fourier, Green and Faraday. Electricity was his favourite subject of research. The writer of this sketch has heard him illustrate the progress in this subject by the fact that, in his early life, he was accustomed to explain his conclusions in it by analogies drawn from the theory of heat ; but, before he died, problems in heat were commonly illustrated by analogous questions in electricity. Kelvin wrote at length on the subject of electromagnetic fields, put forward numerous suggestions about the constitution of ether and matter, and laid the foundation for a scientific system of measurement of electrical quantities. Hydrodynamics, elasticity and thermodynamics were other subjects on which he wrote, and his papers on energy and entropy were of far-reaching importance. We cannot leave Kelvin's work without mentioning the appearance, in 1867, of the treatise on natural philosophy by himself and his friend Peter Guthrie Tait, of Cambridge and Edinburgh. In spite of Tait's collaboration, this book presents an unfinished aspect ; but it is suggestive, and it widely affected modes of physical thought throughout Europe.

The theory of signalling by cable originated in a correspondence between Kelvin and Stokes in 1854, and was elaborated by Kelvin and Kirchhoff, while to the former are largely due the practical applications of it. The earliest successful submarine cable laid between England and the continent dates only from 1851. Owing to the large capacity of the cable and the soakage into the insulating material, powerful currents had to be used before sensible effects could be obtained, and these difficulties increased with the length of the cable. Accordingly, when, in 1857, a cable was laid to America, the operators deemed it necessary to use electricity of a high tension, with the result that the insulation

was ruptured. Subsequently, Kelvin was given a free hand in arranging a system for use with a later cable. He evaded the old difficulties by developing extreme sensitiveness in the receiving instruments and applied the methods of Gauss and Weber for indicating the minute motions of the oscillating needle by the reflection of a ray of light from it, in effect employing a long non-material pointer. In 1870, he substituted for this method a syphon-recorder which printed the message ; and this instrument is still sometimes used. He held that the transmission of signals along the wire of a submarine cable was due to an actual disturbance in the wire : whereas, according to the modern theory, propounded by Maxwell, the function of the wire is merely to guide the disturbance resident in the surrounding dielectric. Kelvin was a keen yachtsman, and was thus led to take up the problem of compasses ; he also bore an active part in the development of electrical engineering. He was the owner of several patents connected with these practical applications of science.

We have next to mention one whose work has had so important an influence on the subsequent growth of the subject as to make it the beginning of a new epoch. This was James Clerk Maxwell—the most modest of men—another member of the Cambridge school, who, for the last eight years of his life, occupied in the university the then newly created chair of experimental physics.

Since the time of Descartes, natural philosophers had never ceased to speculate on the processes by which gravity, light and electricity are transmitted through space. So far as electricity is concerned, the idea of lines of force in a continuous medium is due to Faraday. Kelvin, as a young man, had suggested that electric force might be transmitted through a medium, somewhat as elastic displacements are transmitted through an elastic solid. This idea was taken up by Maxwell, who, in 1856, elaborated the analogies offered by the flow of a liquid, and, five years later, devised a mechanical model of electromagnetic action. He now brought forward a series of arguments to show that an electric current was a phenomenon of translation, magnetism one of rotation and the electrostatic state one of strain of the ether. These conclusions led him to assert that light consists of transverse waves of the same medium as that required for the explanation of electric and magnetic phenomena. On this theory, all currents are closed ; magnetic energy is the kinetic energy of the ether, and electric energy the energy of strain of the ether.



These views were presented, as a whole, in 1864. Further extensions and developments of the theory followed, and the whole was set out in his treatise published in 1873. This celebrated work is far from easy to read, and the exposition is not systematic, but it may be said that the fundamental ideas are now universally accepted, and most of the work of his successors has been built on the foundation here laid. The theory was based on Faraday's ideas ; but it required a trained mathematician to give the final form to his conceptions and to deduce their consequences. Hence, the theory is properly associated with Maxwell's name. Maxwell, also, took a considerable part in framing a standard system of electrical measurements. He contributed largely to the kinetic theory of gases, and, incidentally, to theories on the constitution of matter.

A large part of the history of mathematical physics during the last quarter of the nineteenth century consists of the completion and extension of Maxwell's electromagnetic theory. No inconsiderable part of this is due to his successors at Cambridge, and to describe recent researches in physics without mentioning the names of Lord Rayleigh, Sir Joseph John Thomson and Sir Joseph Larmor is almost impossible ; here, however, we must content ourselves with a very brief account of the general line of investigation followed in the last part of the period covered by the present section.

It has already been pointed out that Maxwell's exposition of his electromagnetic theory of light was neither systematic nor complete. A curious omission in it was the absence of any explanation of reflection and refraction ; this was supplied by Helmholtz. The problem of the effects produced by the translation of electric charges, raised by the same investigator, was solved by the researches of the present Cavendish professor at Cambridge, George Francis FitzGerald of Dublin, and others : in the mathematical development of the theory, which now proceeded apace, they, again, took a prominent part. In 1883, FitzGerald explained a system of magnetic oscillators by which radiant energy could be obtained from electrical sources, thus confirming Maxwell's theoretical conclusion that light was an electromagnetic phenomenon. Some of Maxwell's assumptions on which he had based his theory still remained unconfirmed ; but, a year or two later, the theory was placed on a firmer experimental basis by Hertz. The results, incidentally, led to the introduction of wireless telegraphy.

The question of the conduction of electric discharges through liquids and gases had been raised by Faraday. It was now taken up seriously, and various types of rays, cathode rays, Röntgen rays, etc., were discovered. These researches led to new views on the constitution of matter. The investigations began with a theory of electrons, and, finally, led to the view that every so-called atom is formed by a combination of two elements in varying proportions, and that, possibly, these two elements are to be identified with forms of electricity—one of the most far-reaching hypotheses propounded in recent times.

The efforts to extend the theory of the electromagnetic field to cases where heavy masses are in motion introduces the difficult question as to whether the ether round and in bodies is affected by their motion, and to this theory of relativity much attention is now being paid.

One of the striking features of the Victorian period has been the equipment of large laboratories where experiments can be carried out by students with an accuracy wholly impossible in former days. Two of the earliest of these were built at Oxford and Cambridge, the former known as the Clarendon laboratory in 1872, the latter, known as the Cavendish laboratory, being the gift of the seventh duke of Devonshire. In the latter, Clerk Maxwell taught and has been succeeded by professors not less distinguished. The existence of such laboratories in seats of learning has profoundly affected the teaching of the subject by training large numbers of competent observers, besides calling forth in ever widening circles an intelligent interest in physical studies.

It is not, we think, too much to say that the work in physics of the Victorian period has completely revolutionised the subject, and, both on its theoretical and practical sides, far exceeds in value that previously done in any period of similar extent. The theory of gravitation was the great achievement of the Newtonian school. In the following century, physical optics and, later, the nature of ether attracted most attention from philosophers, while practical men developed the steam-engine and studied the theory of heat. The Victorian age has seen electricity raised to the rank of an all-embracing science, and applied to innumerable industrial uses—power-engines, lighting, heating, telegraphy, telephones. Other important scientific and industrial applications relate to photography and spectrum analysis; the development of the turbine-engine; the invention of the internal combustion-engine, with its

numerous uses in transport on land and water ; the introduction of submarine boats, and heavier-than-air flying-machines ; and the use of wireless telegraphy. In this chapter, however, a bare reference to these practical applications must suffice.

## B. CHEMISTRY

Chemistry has always busied itself with the changes of material things. By working in metals and precious stones, by making colours, by producing things used by artists to give delight to themselves and others, by fashioning natural materials into things useful to men, by concocting potions which had strange effects on the bodies and minds of those who swallowed them, by doing these things and things like these, chemists slowly amassed much knowledge, knowledge, however, which was fragmentary and disconnected. The strange changes which chemists discovered impelled the more ardent and adventurous among them to dream of the possibility of finding a universal medicine which should put an end to disease and suffering and enable the adept to bring all imperfect things to a state of perfection. The history of alchemy is the history of a particular branch of the universal quest, the quest of the unchanging.

In the later years of the eighteenth century, between 1770 and 1790, chemistry passed, at a bound, from being an empirical art to becoming a science. The man who made the great transformation was Antoine Laurent Lavoisier. With the work of the master we are not concerned here.

From the time of Lavoisier to our own day, chemistry has progressed, in the main, along four lines. For some years, chemists concentrated their attention on one definite class of material changes, the changes which happen when substances are burned in the air. The knowledge which was gained of the changes of composition and of properties during combustion incited and guided chemists to a searching examination of the distinctive properties of many different substances, and this examination brought about the clarifying of the conception of definite kinds of matter, and the application of this conception to the opening of many paths of chemical enquiry. While these advances were being made, a quiet member of the Society of Friends presented chemistry with a marvellously delicate and penetrative instrument for furthering accurate knowledge of material changes. John Dalton made

what seemed a small addition to the Greek atomic theory, an addition which changed an interesting speculation into a scientific theory. As the century went on, chemists began to elucidate the connections between chemical events and physical phenomena. The science of physical chemistry began.

Among those who investigated the phenomena of combustion in the eighteenth, and early nineteenth, century, Priestley and Cavendish are pre-eminent. Black was the first chemist to make an accurate, quantitative examination of a particular, limited, chemical change, and, by so doing, to give clearness to the expression 'a homogeneous substance.' The atomic theory was Dalton's gift to science. From the many chemists who amplified the work of Dalton, and used the conceptions of atom and molecule to connect and explain new classes of chemical facts, Williamson and Frankland may be selected as the representatives. As workers in the borderland between chemistry and physics, Graham and Faraday are specially to be remembered. The investigations of Davy touched and illuminated every side of chemical progress.

Besides these men, who greatly enriched and advanced the science of chemistry in the period under review, there were many workers whose contributions cannot be considered here. References are given in the bibliography to the writings of some of them.

Joseph Priestley was a man of many gifts and a very versatile mind. When a youth at an academy, he tells us that he 'saw reason to embrace what is generally called the heterodox side of almost every question.' When about twenty-eight years of age, he taught, in a school at Warrington, languages (he had a great natural gift of tongues), oratory and criticism, elocution, logic, natural phenomena, civil law and anatomy.

In the seventies of the eighteenth century, Priestley turned his attention to different kinds of airs. He obtained and partially examined many gases, but rarely troubled about separating them completely from impurities. In August 1774, Priestley obtained a large lens with which he concentrated the sun's rays on whatever substance happened to come to his hand, with the object of finding what air could be extracted from it. When he thus heated *mercurius calcinatus per se* (now called oxide of mercury), he obtained an air in which a candle burned with a 'remarkably vigorous flame.' This result, he says, 'surprised me more than I can well express.' The new air was subjected to many tests; it always

behaved in a very unexpected manner. He placed a mouse in his new air; the mouse remained lively, and the air did not become 'noxious.' The results of other experiments caused Priestley to lie awake through the night 'in utter astonishment.' At last, he concluded that the new air was 'between four and five times as good as common air.' He regarded the new air as a very superior kind of common air.

Priestley thought alchemically, not as a chemist. To the alchemist, the properties of things were external wrappings which might be removed from one thing and put round another, without affecting the essential substance of either thing, which substance it was the business of properties to hide from the uninitiated. Priestley thought of different airs as identical, or nearly identical, in substance, and only apparently different because of superficial differences in the mantles, the properties, by which the essential substance was concealed. When he obtained the air from burnt mercury, he thought he had removed from common air something which made it 'noxious, vitiated, depraved, corrupt.' He had not learnt, what Black's experiments, made twenty years before 1774, might have taught him, that each particular, material thing is known only by its properties. Priestley's forced explanation of the facts which he himself discovered helped to convince investigators that the notion of identity of substance hidden under differences of properties is a great hindrance to the acquirement of accurate knowledge of natural events.

Priestley could not get over his astonishment at the behaviour of the new air. In science, one does well to be astonished; but, to astonishment one must add investigation, to investigation, reasoning, and, to reasoning, more investigation. Stopping at astonishment, Priestley made his facts square with the theory that dominated him, the theory of phlogiston. The phlogisticians taught that something, which they had named phlogiston, the principle of fire, rushes out of a burning substance as it burns. Phlogiston was never captured. Priestley held that the elusive phlogiston is a great corrupter of your airs or gases. He supposed that he had deprived common air of this depraving principle; he named his new gas *dephlogisticated air*. He invented many very ingenious hypotheses to account for facts observed by himself. Had he made a few accurate quantitative experiments, he might have broken the toils of his favourite theory.

The French chemist Lavoisier saw the importance of Priestley's discovery of dephlogisticated air, and, by a series of rigidly

quantitative experiments with tin and mercury, proved that, when a substance burns in air, it combines with a constituent of the air which air-constituent is the gas prepared by Priestley. Lavoisier called this gas *oxygen*, because many of its compounds are acids.

Priestley's insatiable curiosity, his mental alertness, his impatience of details, were required for the advancement of chemistry, no less than the passionless determination and the scrupulous accuracy of Cavendish.

Henry Cavendish, of Peterhouse, was bred in the theory of phlogiston, as Priestley was, and remained faithful to that theory, as Priestley did. He thought of many airs, or gases, as more or less phlogisticated forms of a few particular substances. Cavendish described the explosion of a mixture of common air and inflammable air (obtained by the action of acids on zinc) as one of the ways of phlogisticating air. This process is accompanied by a decrease in the volume of the interacting gases. Cavendish tried to discover the cause of this decrease. He exploded accurately measured volumes of dephlogisticated air (oxygen) and inflammable air (hydrogen), and found that water was the sole product of the change when dephlogisticated air was mixed with twice its volume of inflammable air. The explanation which Cavendish gave of this fundamentally important fact was confused and vague, because he insisted on making the facts uphold the phlogistic theory. Without knowing exactly what he had done, Cavendish had determined the quantitative volumetric composition of water. When the phlogistic theory had been swept away, the very great importance of the accurate work of Cavendish became manifest.

Joseph Black graduated as doctor of medicine in the university of Edinburgh in 1755, presenting a thesis entitled *Magnesia alba, Quicklime, and other alkaline substances*. That thesis is probably the earliest example of a genuinely scientific chemical investigation. Black proved that mild magnesia (now called magnesium carbonate) loses weight when it is calcined; he determined the loss of weight; he proved that the solid substance which remains after calcination has properties of its own which distinguish it from mild magnesia; he showed that, during calcination, an air, or gas, is given off, different from any air, or gas, then known; he examined, accurately, the properties of this gas, which he called fixed air; and he reproduced the original quantity of mild magnesia by dissolving the calcined magnesia in acid, and

adding fixed alkali (now called potassium carbonate), a substance which he proved to give off fixed air when it is calcined. By his experiments, Black proved mild magnesia to be composed of fixed air united with calcined magnesia, and showed that each of these three substances is a particular and definite kind of matter, distinguished from all other kinds of matter by constant qualities. He also proved that the change which happens when chalk is burned is exactly similar to the calcining of mild magnesia; fixed air is driven out of the chalk, and burnt lime—a perfectly definite homogeneous substance—remains.

The work of Black prepared the way for the penetrative, experimental analysis of the phenomena of combustion; it taught chemists to use accurately observed properties of bodies as the only means of distinguishing one body from another; it showed that, if chemical investigation is to produce results of permanent value, it must be quantitative; incidentally, by isolating and examining fixed air, it began a new branch of chemistry, the study of the changes of composition and properties which happen when homogeneous gases interact.

Black and Cavendish were painstaking, methodical, unemotional, eminently clear-headed. Priestley was flighty, flitting from one thing to another in his laboratory, always curious, never working out his discoveries, unable to think chemically outside of the theory which dominated him. Black, Cavendish and Priestley greatly advanced the science of chemistry.

So long as chemists formed vague generalisations founded on introspective speculations, they made little progress. It was by concentrating their attention on a few limited occurrences, and accurately examining these by quantitative experiments, that chemists gradually gained clear conceptions which could be directly used in the investigation of more complicated chemical changes. 'True genius,' Coleridge said, 'begins by generalising and condensing; it ends in realising and expanding.' The vague generalising of the alchemists was followed by the condensing work of Black and Cavendish, and by the suggestive discoveries of Priestley. The time was approaching for realising and expanding.

In 1808, a small book appeared, entitled *A new system of Chemical Philosophy, Part I*, by John Dalton. The influence of that book on the development of chemistry, and of physics also, has been very great.

Dalton delivered a lecture in Manchester, in 1803, wherein he said 'An enquiry into the relative weights of the ultimate particles

of bodies is a subject, so far as I know, entirely new; I have lately been prosecuting this enquiry with remarkable success.' Many of Dalton's predecessors, both chemists and physicists, had used, in a vague and general manner, the Greek conception of the atomic structure of matter. Dalton showed how the relative weights of atoms can be determined. By doing that, he brought down the atomic theory to the solid earth, and made it a bold, suggestive, stimulating guide ready for the use of chemists and physicists.

Dalton was not a great experimenter; he generally used the results of other chemists' experiments. He was a scientific thinker, characterised by boldness and caution. Dalton assumed, as Lucretius had done long before him, that matter has a grained structure; that all the ultimate particles of each particular homogeneous substance are identical, and differ in properties, one of which is their weight, from the particles of all other definite substances; he also assumed that the mechanism of chemical changes, that is, changes wherein homogeneous substances are produced different from those present when the changes began, is the coalescence of atoms of different kinds to form new sorts of atoms.

In order to find the relative weights of atoms, Dalton argued as follows: Analyses and syntheses of water show that eight grains of oxygen unite with one grain of hydrogen to form water. If this change is the union of atoms of oxygen with atoms of hydrogen, to form atoms of water, and if all the atoms of each one of these three homogeneous substances are identical in weight and other properties, it follows that an atom of oxygen is eight times heavier than an atom of hydrogen. If we take the atomic weight of hydrogen as unity—because hydrogen is lighter than any other known substance—then the atomic weight of oxygen is eight, and the atomic weight of water is nine.

In arriving at the conclusion that the atomic weight of oxygen is eight, if the atomic weight of hydrogen is one, Dalton made the assumption that a single atom of oxygen unites with one atom of hydrogen to form an atom of water. He made this assumption because it was simpler than any other. Had he chosen to suppose that two atoms of hydrogen unite with one atom of oxygen, he must have assigned to oxygen the atomic weight sixteen, and to water the atomic weight eighteen.

To make Dalton's method perfectly general, and quite conclusive in its results, it was necessary to find means for fixing the relative weights of the atoms formed by the union of other, simpler, atoms;



it was also necessary to find means of determining the number of atoms of each kind which unite to form a more complex atom. A general method for solving these two problems was given to chemistry in 1811—12 by an Italian physical chemist named Avogadro, who brought into science the notion of a second order of minute particles, supplementing the conception of atom by that of molecule.

It is not possible in this brief sketch to indicate the many new fields of investigation which were opened, and made fruitful, by the Daltonian atomic theory. From the many workers who used this theory as a means for pressing forward along new lines of enquiry, two may be selected, since their work is typical of much that was done in chemistry during the first half of the nineteenth century.

Alexander Williamson strove to make chemists realise the need of using the Avogadorean molecule as well as the Daltonian atom. By his work on etherification, and by other experimental investigations, as well as by reasoning on his own results and those obtained by other chemists, Williamson demonstrated the fruitfulness of the notion of the molecule. He endeavoured to determine the relative weights of molecules by purely chemical methods. These methods proved to be less satisfactory, and much less general, than the physical method which had been described by Avogadro.

The conception of equivalency, that is, equal value in exchange, of determinate weights of different homogeneous substances, has been very helpful in chemistry. In 1852, Edward Frankland applied the notion of equivalency to the atoms of elements, that is, homogeneous substances which have not been separated into unlike parts. He arranged the elements in groups, the atoms of those in any one group being of equal value in exchange, inasmuch as each of these atoms combines with the same number of other atoms to form molecules.

When Frankland's conception had been developed, and the method of determining the equivalency of atoms made more definite and more workable, a vast new field of enquiry was opened, a field which has proved remarkably fruitful both in purely scientific work, and in applied chemistry. It is not an exaggeration to say that the great industry of making aniline colours is an outcome of the notion of atomic equivalency introduced by Frankland into chemical science.

The words element and principle were used by the alchemist as nearly synonymous; both words were used vaguely. The

meaning given to the term element, by Lavoisier, towards the end of the eighteenth century—a definite kind of matter which has not been decomposed, that is, separated into unlike parts—was elucidated, and confirmed as the only fruitful connotation of the term by the work of Sir Humphry Davy on potash and soda in 1808.

Humphry Davy was the most brilliant of English chemists. He was the friend of Wordsworth and Sir Walter Scott. Lockhart says that the conversation of Davy and Scott was fascinating and invigorating. Each drew out the powers of the other.

I remember William Laidlaw whispering to me, one night when their ‘rapt talk’ had kept the circle round the fire until long after the usual bedtime of Abbotsford—‘Gude preserve us! this is a very superior occasion!’<sup>1</sup>

Davy sent an electric current through pieces of potash and soda; the solids melted, and ‘small globules, having a high metallic lustre, and being precisely similar in visible characters to quicksilver, appeared.’ By burning the metal-like globules, Davy obtained potash and soda. Making his experiments quantitative, weighing the potash and the soda before passing the current, and the potash and soda obtained by burning the metal-like products of the first change, he proved that potash and soda, which, at that time, were classed with the elements, are composed each of a metal combined with oxygen. The new metals—potassium and sodium—are soft and very light, and instantly combine with oxygen when they are exposed to the air.

Everyone had been accustomed to think of a metal as a heavy, hard solid, unchanged, or very slowly changed, by exposure to air. Had chemists strictly defined the term metal, they could not have allowed the bases of potash and soda (as Davy called the new substances) to be included among metals. Happily, the definitions of natural science are not as the definitions of the logician; they are descriptive summaries of what is known, and suggestive guides to further enquiry.

As every attempt to separate potassium and sodium into unlike parts failed, Davy put them into the class elements; he said—‘Till a body is decomposed, it should be considered as simple.’

In 1810, Davy investigated a substance concerning the composition of which a fierce controversy raged. Oxymuriatic acid was said by almost all chemists at that time to be a compound of oxygen with an unknown base. No one had been able to get

<sup>1</sup> *Life of Sir Walter Scott* (6 vols., 1900), vol. III, p. 403

oxygen from it, or to isolate the base supposed to be a constituent of it. By putting away, for the time, all hypotheses and speculations, and by conducting his experiments quantitatively, Davy showed that oxymuriatic acid is not an acid, but is a simple substance, that is, a substance which is not decomposed in any of the changes it undergoes. He proposed to name this simple substance chlorine; a name, Davy said, 'founded upon one of its obvious and characteristic properties—its colour.' Davy remarked—'Names should express things not opinions.'

Davy thought much about the connections between chemical affinity and electrical energy, and investigated these connections by well planned experiments. In 1807, he said—'May not the electrical energy be identical with chemical affinity?' He used the expressions—'different electrical states,' and 'degrees of exaltation of the electrical states,' of the particles of bodies. Recent researches into the subject of chemical affinity have established the great importance of the conceptions adumbrated by Davy in these expressions.

Chemistry, the study of the changes of composition and properties which happen when homogeneous substances interact, has always been closely connected with physics, the study of the behaviour of substances apart from those interactions of them in which composition is changed. Among the earlier physical chemists, Graham occupies an important place.

Thomas Graham was a shy, retiring man, most of whose life was spent in his laboratory. There is a tradition in the Glasgow institution, where he taught chemistry, in his younger days, before moving to London (in his later years he was master of the mint), that, when he came into the lecture theatre, to deliver his first lecture to a large audience, he looked around in dismay and fled.

Graham established the fundamental phenomena of the diffusion of gases and of liquids; he distinguished, and applied the distinction, between crystalloids, solutions of which pass through animal and vegetable membranes, and colloids, which do not pass through those membranes. The investigation of the behaviour of colloidal substances has led, in recent years, to great advances in the knowledge of phenomena common to chemistry, physics and biology.

Electrochemistry, the study of the connections between chemical and electrical actions, has been productive, in recent years, of more far-reaching results than have been obtained in any other branch of physical chemistry. Much of what has been done in the last

half-century is based on the work of Faraday, and, indirectly, on the suggestion of Davy. Both were men of genius, that is, men who see the central position of the problem they are investigating, who seize and hold that position until the problem is solved, letting the surface phenomena, for the time, 'go to the dogs, what matters? Men of genius work from the centre outwards.

To Michael Faraday, we owe the fundamental terms of electrochemistry. The separation of a salt into two parts by the electric current, he called electrolysis; the surfaces from which the current passes into, and out of, an electrolysable compound, he named electrodes; the substances liberated at the electrodes, he called ions. Faraday measured 'the chemical power of a current' by the quantities of the ions set free during a determinate period of electrolysis. Taking as his unit the quantity of electricity which liberates one gram of hydrogen from an electrolysable compound of that element, he showed that the weights of different ions liberated from compounds by unit quantity of electricity are in the proportion of their chemical equivalents. Using the language of the atomic theory, Faraday declared that 'the atoms of bodies which are equivalent to each other in their ordinary chemical action have equal quantities of electricity mutually associated with them.'

In 1834, Faraday said—'The forces called electricity and chemical affinity are one and the same.' Faraday distinguished the intensity of electricity from the quantity of it, and indicated the meaning of each of these factors. One would not greatly exaggerate if one said that the notable advances made in the last quarter of a century in the elucidation of chemical affinity are but developments and applications of Faraday's pregnant work on the two factors of electrical energy.

The results established by Faraday have led to the conception of atoms of electricity, a conception which has been of great service in advancing the study of radioactivity. Faraday's results have also been the incentives and guides in researches which go to the root of many problems of the physical sciences, and of not a few of the biological sciences also.

At the time of the foundation of the Royal Society, chemistry was a conglomeration of more or less useful recipes, and a dream of the elixir. Today, chemistry is becoming an almost universal science. Happily, chemists still dream.

## C. BIOLOGY

Although science, during the eighteenth century, was, like many other intellectual activities in our country, more or less in abeyance, an attempt has been made, in the following pages, to carry on the subject in the present chapter from that which appeared in a previous volume (VIII) of this *History*.

'The Royal Society of London for Improving Natural Knowledge,' one of the oldest scientific societies in the world and certainly the oldest in the empire, was formally founded in 1660, and received its royal charter of incorporation two years later. At a preliminary meeting, a list had been prepared of some forty 'names of such persons as were known to those present whom they judged willing and fit to joyne... in the designe,' and among these names we find those of 'Mr Robert Boyle, Sir Kenelme Digby, Mr Evelyn, Dr Ward, Dr Wallis, Dr Glisson, Dr Ent, Dr Cowley, Dr Willis, Dr Wren,' names whose owners have been dwelt upon in volume VIII.

Thus, for the first time in our country, the study of science was, to a degree, organised and its advancement promoted, not only by periodical meetings where experiments were conducted and criticism freely offered, but by the collection of scientific books, which still remain at Burlington house, and of 'natural objects,' which have for long formed part of the British Museum's collections.

So Virtuous and so Noble a Design,  
So Human for its Use, for Knowledge so Divine,

as Abraham Cowley, the laureate of the new movement, wrote, was, in part, a protest against the credulity and superstitions of a credulous and superstitious age, and the word 'natural,' as used in the charter, was used in deliberate opposition to 'super-natural,' the aim of the society being, at any rate in part, to discourage divination and witchcraft.

We have said something about the brilliant band of physiologists, headed by Harvey, who made the Stewart period remarkable in the annals of English science; though there were then other biologists less gifted than Harvey, but still leaders in their several fields. The recent invention of the microscope had given a great impetus to the study of the anatomical structure of plants and, later, of animals; and, in relation to this, we must not overlook

the work of Nehemiah Grew, who, with the Italian Malpighi, may be considered a co-founder of the science of plant-anatomy.

Nehemiah Grew studied at Pembroke hall, Cambridge, and afterwards took his doctor's degree at Leyden. He published numerous treatises dealing with the anatomy of vegetables, and with the comparative anatomy of trunks, roots, and so forth, illustrated by admirable, if somewhat diagrammatic, plates. Although essentially an anatomist, he made certain investigations into plant physiology and suggested many more. Perhaps his most interesting contribution to botany, however, was his discovery that flowering plants, like animals, have male and female sexes. It seems odd to reflect that this discovery is only about 250 years old. When Grew began to work, the study of botany was in a very neglected condition—the old herbal had ceased to interest, and, with its contemporary, the bestiary, was disappearing from current use, while the work of some of Grew's contemporaries, notably Robert Morison and John Ray, hastened their disappearance. Of these two systematists, Ray, on the whole, was the more successful. His classification of plants obtained in England until the latter half of the eighteenth century, when it was gradually replaced by the Linnaean method of classification.

But Ray has other claims on our regard. He and Francis Willughby, both of Trinity college, attacked a similar problem in the animal kingdom. Willughby was the only son of wealthy and titled parents, while Ray was the son of a village blacksmith. But the older universities are great levellers, and Ray succeeded in infusing into his fellow student at Cambridge his own genuine love for natural history. With Willughby, he started forth on his methodical investigations of animals and plants in all the accessible parts of the world. Willughby died young and bequeathed a small benefaction and his manuscripts to his older friend. After his death, Ray undertook to revise and complete his *Ornithology*, and therein paid great attention to the internal anatomy, to the habits and to the eggs of most of the birds he described. He, further, edited Willughby's *History of Fishes*, but perpetuated the mistake of his predecessors in retaining whales among that group. In rather rationalistic mood, he argues that the fish which swallowed Jonah must have been a shark. Perhaps the weakest of their three great histories—the *History of Insects*—was such owing to the fact that Ray edited it in his old age.

Ray was always a fine field naturalist, and his catalogues of Cambridgeshire plants long remained a classic. We may, perhaps,

sum up the contributions of this great naturalist in the words of Miall :

During his long and strenuous life he introduced many lasting improvements—fuller descriptions, better definitions, better associations, better sequences. He strove to rest his distinctions upon knowledge of structure, which he personally investigated at every opportunity....His greatest single improvement was the division of the herbs into Monocotyledons and Dicotyledons<sup>1</sup>.

Robert Hooke, a Westminster boy and, later, a student at Christ Church, was at once instructor and assistant to Boyle. The year that the Royal Society received their charter, they appointed Hooke curator, and his duty was 'to furnish the Society' every day they met with three or four considerable experiments. This amazing task he fulfilled in spite of the fact that 'the fabrication of instruments for experiments was not commonly known to workmen,' and that he never received 'above £50 a year and that not certain.' Hooke was a man of amazing versatility, very self-confident, attacking problems in all branches of science, greatly aiding their advance, but avid of fame.

In person but dispicable, being crooked and low in nature and as he grew older more and more deformed. He was always very pale and lean and latterly nothing but skin and bone<sup>2</sup>.

His active, jealous mind conceived that almost every discovery of his time had been there initiated; and this anxiety to claim 'priority' induced Newton to suppress his treatise *Optics* until after the date of Hooke's death. His book *Micrographia*, 'a most excellent piece, of which I am very proud,' as Pepys has it, is the record of what a modern schoolboy newly introduced to the microscope would write down. Yet he was undoubtedly, although not a lovable character, the best 'mechanic of his age.'

British physiology, which had started magnificently with Harvey, and had continued under Mayow, de Mayerne and others, was carried forward by Stephen Hales, at one time fellow of Corpus Christi college, Cambridge, and for years perpetual curate at Teddington. He was a born experimenter, and, as a student, worked in the 'elaboratory of Trinity College,' which had been established under the rule of Bentley, ever anxious to make his college the leader in every kind of learning. Sachs has pointed out that, during the eighteenth century, the study of the anatomy of plants made but little progress; but there was a very real

<sup>1</sup> *The Early Naturalists*, L. C. Miall, London, 1912.

<sup>2</sup> Waller's *Life of Hooke*, 1705.

advance in our knowledge of plant physiology. This, in the main, was due to Hales; he investigated the rate of transpiration and held views as to the force causing the ascent of sap which have recently come to their own; he recognised that the air might be a source of food for the plant and 'connected the assimilative function of leaves with the action of light,' though he failed to find the mode of the interaction. He worked much on gases, and paved the way for Priestley and others by devising methods of collecting them over water. Hales, this 'poor, good, primitive creature,' as Horace Walpole called him, was not less remarkable as an investigator of animal physiology, and was the first to measure the blood-pressure, and the rate of flow in the capillaries. Sir Francis Darwin states:

In first opening the way to a correct appreciation of blood-pressure Hales' work may rank second in importance to Harvey's in founding the modern science of physiology.

He was, further, a man of 'many inventions,' especially in the fields of ventilation and hygiene.

The beginning of our period coincides with the formation of public museums. Previous to the Stewart times, collections of 'natural objects' were, for the most part, housed in churches, in the houses of the great, in coffee-houses and in the shops of apothecaries; but now public libraries were being established, and, in many of these, botanical, geological and especially zoological specimens found a home. In more than one Cambridge college, the library still gives shelter to a skeleton, a relic of the time when anatomy was taught within the college walls; and, at this day, the curious, and, at times, inconvenient, yoke joining the museum at South Kensington with the museum in Bloomsbury testifies to this primitive state of affairs.

In 1728, John Woodward bequeathed his 'Fossils, a vast quantities of Ores, Minerals and Shells, with other curiosities well worth viewing' to Cambridge university; it was housed in the university library and formed the nucleus about which the present magnificent museum has collected. For many years, the Royal Society maintained a museum which, at one time, contained 'the stones taken out of Lord Belcarre's heart in a silver box,'... 'a petrified fish, the skin of an antelope which died in St James' Park, a petrified foetus' and 'a bottle full of stag's tears. The trustees of Gresham college assigned the long gallery as a home for these and other 'rarities'; but, when the society, in 1781, migrated to Somerset house, the entire collection was handed over



to the British Museum. The charter of the last named is dated 1753, and its beginnings were the library of Sir Robert Cotton, which the nation had purchased in 1700, and the collections of Sir Hans Sloane, which were now purchased with the proceeds of a lottery, set on foot for this purpose. The collections of this 'General Repository,' as the act of 1753 called the museum, were kept together until the middle of the nineteenth century, when, after long delay, the natural history objects were transferred to South Kensington and housed in a building which, in all respects, was worthy of the Board of Works of the time.

John Tradescant and his son of the same name accumulated and stored in south Lambeth a 'museum which was considered to be the most extensive in Europe at that time.' It was acquired in 1659 by Elias Ashmole, and, with his own collections, passed by gift, twenty-three years later, to Oxford university, the whole forming the nucleus of the present Ashmolean museum.

Want of space precludes the consideration of other museums; but it may be remarked that the earlier collectors got together their treasures much as schoolboys now collect, their taste was universal and no rarity was too trivial for their notice. Such collections excited popular interest, and 'a museum of curiosities' was often an added attraction to the London coffee-house. At the end of the eighteenth century, the coffee-house part of the enterprise was dropped, and the museum, with an entrance-fee and a priced catalogue, formed a source of revenue to many a collector, most of whom were not too scrupulous in their identifications. The dime museums in the Bowery, New York, are their modern successors. These museums were of little scientific or educational value; at best, they stimulated the imagination of the uninformed, or allowed a child to see with his own eyes something he had read about in his books. The normal, as a rule, was passed by, the abnormal treasured. Ethnographical objects were collected, not so much to arouse in the spectator a desire to study seriously 'y<sup>e</sup> beastlie devices of y<sup>e</sup> heathen' as to excite and startle him with their rough unfinish, on the one hand, and their high finish on the other. The collections of the museums were ill arranged, inaccurately labelled and inaccessible to students; the staff were wholly inadequate and mainly dependent for their living on admission fees. It was not until the nineteenth century was well advanced that a systematic and scientific attempt was made to identify specimens accurately, to arrange them logically, to label them fully and, further, to collect in the

background, unseen by the fleeting visitor, vast accumulations of material for the investigation of the genuine student and researcher.

Museums as centres of real education, not as places of wonder and vacant amazement, are almost affairs of our time, and it was not until the twentieth century that official guides were appointed to explain their treasures to the enquiring visitor. Even today, the system of weekly lectures on the contents of a museum which obtains largely on the other side of the Atlantic is, with us, only beginning.

We must not omit to mention the magnificent museum of the Royal college of Surgeons, in London, which incorporates the Hunterian collection brought together by John Hunter, and which has been growing ever since his time. Of its kind, it is without a rival in the world.

During the seventeenth century, men of science still, to a great extent, remained the gifted amateurs they were at the time of the foundation of the Royal Society; and yet they were very successful in establishing many institutions which had a greater effect on the advance of biological sciences than their founders foresaw.

Towards the beginning of the seventeenth century, the Oxford botanic garden had been founded (1621), which was followed, in 1667, by the opening of the Edinburgh botanic garden, and, in 1673, by the foundation of the Chelsea physic garden, by the Apothecaries' company. At the beginning of the eighteenth century, Glasgow followed suit. By this time, many of the universities had chairs of botany, and botany and anatomy were the first biological sciences represented by professorial chairs in this country. In 1724, a chair was established at Cambridge, with Bradley as its first professor; but he and his immediate followers had little success and, for the most part, were non-resident. Oxford followed, in 1734, and Dillenius was the first to occupy the chair, which had been founded by William Sherrard. The botanic garden at Oxford, however, had been in existence for many years. At Cambridge, it was not till 1759 that Walker founded the botanic garden, which, at that time, occupied the northern site of the present museums of science. The fine specimen of the *Sophora* tree, the tree which yields the Chinese imperial yellow dye, is the last and only memorial of this old botanic garden. In 1765, Kew gardens, originally in possession of the Capel family, were combined with Richmond gardens, then occupied by the

princess Augusta, widow of Frederick, prince of Wales. In fact, this lady may be regarded as the foundress of Kew, which, since her time, has played the leading part in the dissemination of botanical knowledge throughout the world.

In the latter half of the eighteenth century, the Linnaean system of classification had been generally adopted in Great Britain, and, in the year 1783, Sir James Edward Smith secured, from the mother of Linnaeus, for £1050, the entire Linnaean collections. These did not, however, reach these islands without an effort on the part of the Swedish government to retrieve them. Indeed, it sent a man-of-war after the ship which transported them.

Following on this acquisition, Smith, in 1788, founded the Linnaean society, the immediate effect of which, perhaps, was to bring about a revolution in the mode of publishing scientific literature. From the first, the Linnaean society issued journals and transactions instead of books or treatises; their publications took the form of memoirs read before the society. In this respect, the Linnaean society set a fashion which has been consistently followed by the numerous societies which since have sprung up.

The Royal Society had taken all science as its province, and nothing in natural history was alien to the activities of the Linnaean society; but, with the beginning of the nineteenth century, societies began to spring up in the metropolis which devoted their energies to the advancement of one science alone.

The earliest effort was that of the Royal Horticultural society, founded in 1803. Its first secretary was Joseph Sabine, to whom much of its earlier success was due. For a time, it undertook the training of gardeners and also sent collectors to foreign countries in search of horticultural rarities. It still does much for horticulture, especially by its very successful flower-shows.

The Geological society of London was founded in 1807. It was partly the outcome of a previous club known as the Askesian society, and among the more prominent founders were William Babington, Humphry Davy, George Greenough and others. The meetings were at first held at the Freemasons' tavern. The society, like many other learned societies, now has rooms at Burlington house.

The Zoological society of London for the advancement of zoology and animal physiology, and for the introduction of new and curious subjects of the animal kingdom was founded in

1826 by Sir Stamford Raffles, the wellknown traveller and governor in the east and the godfather of *Rafflesia*, J. Sabine, N. A. Vigors and other eminent naturalists. It was incorporated by royal charter in 1829.

The Royal Botanic society was founded in 1839, and was granted an area of eighteen acres within the inner circle of Regent's park, and here Marnock laid out the gardens very much as they still are. Shortly after its establishment, annual exhibitions or flower-shows were begun, and such exhibitions, not entirely confined to flowers, are still one of the features of the society.

Another society which has played a most useful part in the promotion of science is the Cambridge Philosophical society, founded in the year 1819, the only society outside the capital towns which possesses a royal charter. About the same time, the Dublin society (founded in 1731) assumed the title royal. The Edinburgh Royal society was founded in 1783; the date of its revised charter is 1811. Many other societies in our chief towns did much to advance the cause of science; but they are too numerous to record here.

Another institution which embraced all branches of science was the British Association for the Advancement of Science, which was due largely to the enterprise of Brewster, Babbage and Herschel. It held its first meeting in York in the year 1831. The objects of its founders were

to give a stronger impulse and a more systematic direction to scientific enquiry, to promote the intercourse of those who cultivate science in different parts of the British Empire with one another, and with foreign philosophers, to obtain a more general attention to the objects of science, and the removal of any disadvantages of a public kind, which impede its progress.

With certain exceptions, the books on biology during the last half of the eighteenth century and the beginning of the nineteenth, were largely treatises on classification, or on the practical application of the knowledge of plants, such as medical and agricultural works. It was during this period, too, that certain magazines were started. Curtis founded *The Botanical Magazine* in the year 1787. But the great increase of scientific journals only began some fifty years later; many of those dealing with different branches of biological science were first published about the middle of the nineteenth century. Among them may be mentioned the following, with the date of their first appearance: *The Annals and Magazine of Natural History*, 1841; *The*

*Zoologist*, 1843; *Quarterly Journal of Microscopical Science*, 1853; *The Journal of Horticulture*, 1862; *The Geological Magazine*, 1864; *The Journal of Anatomy and Physiology*, 1866.

Great advance was also being made in our knowledge of the flora and fauna of the British dominions beyond the seas. Prominent among explorers was Sir Joseph Banks, who studied the flora of Newfoundland in 1766 and, later, accompanied by Solander and others, started with Cook on his memorable voyage round the world in the 'Endeavour.' He returned to England in 1771 and, during the following year, visited Iceland. Banks's very extensive explorations helped to make Kew the centre of botanical activity, an activity which soon became world-wide. It is worth recalling that his private secretary was the distinguished botanist Robert Brown, to whom he bequeathed his herbarium and library. Brown took part in the celebrated expedition of Flinders to Australia, which started in 1801, and added greatly to our knowledge of the fauna and flora of Australasia. Nor must it be forgotten that Brown was the first to observe the cell-nucleus. This, as one of his biographers remarks, was 'a triumph of genius,' for Brown worked only with the simple microscope, and the technique of staining cells and tissues was then unknown. It is interesting to note that the nucleus was described and figured eight years before the surrounding protoplasm attracted attention. In fact, in the early part of the nineteenth century, repeated improvements in the microscope and in histological technique were demonstrating very clearly that all living organisms, whether plant or animal, consist either of a single cell or a complex of cells, and that they all began life as a single cellular unit.

At the beginning of the nineteenth century, men of science specialised less than now. Each branch of science was smaller, and more than one branch could be grasped and studied by the same observer. Among such men were J. S. Henslow and Adam Sedgwick, the prime movers in the founding of the Cambridge Philosophical society. Henslow, at first, devoted especial attention to conchology, entomology and geology. He was a professor of mineralogy at twenty-six, and with that power of quick change of chair, once more prevalent than now, he became professor of botany the following year. He was succeeded in the chair of mineralogy by Whewell, which recalls the fact that Whewell's *History of the Inductive Sciences*, one of the

wellknown *Bridgewater treatises*, played a large part in the thought of our great-grandparents. Henslow was among the first to insist upon practical work in his botanical classes. His class dissected living plants, and investigated and recorded such structure as they could make out. He provided them with proper apparatus for dissections, and he saw that they studied the physiology and the minute anatomy of plants as well as external features.

Another striking feature of the British botanists of a hundred years ago was their determined and steady effort to replace the artificial Linnaean system by a more natural one. Prominent among the men who gradually evolved a sounder view of the interrelationship of plants were the elder Hooker, Robert Brown, Sir Joseph Banks ('the greatest Englishman of his time'), Bentham and, especially, John Lindley. Lindley was professor at the newly-founded university college in Gower street; and this institution took a very prominent part in the science of the century, being untrammelled by restrictions which sorely retarded the advancement of science at the older universities.

Plant pathology was, also, coming to the fore, and Miles Joseph Berkeley was establishing a permanent reputation as a systematic mycologist. He has, indeed, been called the originator and founder of plant pathology, and was the first to recognise the economic importance of many fungoid plant diseases. His work on *Phytophthora infestans*—the potato fungus—(1846) is still a classic.

Another branch of science, of less economic but of more academic interest, was plant palaeontology, which, under Witham, Binney and Williamson—the last named was elected, in 1851, professor of natural history, anatomy and physiology at the newly-founded Owens college, Manchester—was rapidly forging ahead, at any rate in the north of England. Here, chiefly, the foundations were being laid for the very remarkable advances which have been made in this branch of the subject since the last quarter of the nineteenth century.

Modern geology, in Great Britain, might be said to begin with James Hutton, who, after taking the degree of doctor of medicine at Leyden, devoted himself to the cultivation of a small estate, inherited from his father, and to practical chemistry. The lucrative results of the latter employment enabled him to give himself up wholly to scientific pursuits. His agricultural studies, especially during his residence with a farmer in Norfolk, interested him in

the various sediments deposited either by rivers or seas, and he recognised that much of the present land had once been below the sea. But he also investigated the movements of strata and the origin of igneous rocks, and especially the nature and relations of granite. The great and distinctive feature of Hutton's work in geology is the strictly inductive method applied throughout. He maintained 'that the great masses of the earth are the same everywhere.' He 'saw no occasion to have recourse to the agency of any preternatural cause in explaining what actually occurs,' and he remarks that, 'the result therefore of our present enquiry is, that we find no vestige of a beginning—no prospect of an end.'

John Playfair, a pupil and friend of Hutton, issued, in 1802, a volume entitled *Illustrations of the Huttonian Theory of the Earth*. Playfair, to quote Sir A. Geikie's words, was 'gifted with a clear penetrating mind, a rare faculty of orderly logical arrangement, and an English style of altogether remarkable precision and elegance.' He was an able exponent of his master's views and capable of adding many observations and contributions of his own to his convincing sketch of the Huttonian theory.

William Smith, whom Sedgwick called the 'father of English Geology,' became interested in the structure of the earth's crust, at first, from a land-surveyor's and engineer's point of view. He was one of the earliest to recognise that each of the strata he studied carefully contains animal and plant fossils peculiar to itself, by which it can be identified. In 1815, he published his geological map of England and Wales; and, between 1794 and 1821, he issued separate geological maps of many English counties. Further he is responsible for introducing many terms—'arbitrary and somewhat uncouth,' as Sedgwick remarked—which have become the verbal currency of British geology.

Adam Sedgwick, whose personality made a deep impression on his university, was appointed Woodwardian professor of geology in 1818, and threw himself, with surprising vigour, into a subject which, to him, at that time, was almost new. He was great as a teacher and as an exponent of his science, being gifted with eloquence, and, as founder of the Sedgwick museum, he greatly enlarged the collection got together by John Woodward, who established the professorship. From 1819 to 1823, he worked chiefly in the south and east of England; then, he turned his attention to Lake-land and, afterwards, in 1827, to Scotland (with Murchison). In 1829, he went abroad with Murchison, visiting

parts of Germany and the eastern Alps, the result being an important joint paper on the latter (1829-30). In the long vacation of 1831, he attacked the problem of the ancient rocks in the northern part of Wales, which, owing to the absence of good maps or easy communication, the complicated structure of the country and the frequent rarity or imperfect preservation of its fossils, presented exceptional difficulties. In that and the following summer (as well as in some later visits), he ascertained the general succession of the rocks from the base of the Cambrian to the top of the Bala, or of the whole series afterwards called Cambrian and lower Silurian (more recently Ordovician). Laborious fieldwork became more difficult after an illness in 1839; but he continued to extend and publish the results of his investigations in Wales, in the Lake district and in the Permo-Triassic strata of north-eastern England. Though he was a liberal in politics, his inclinations as a geologist were conservative.

George Julius Poulett Scrope, by his studies of volcanic districts in Italy, Sicily and Germany, and especially by his memoir on the volcanoes of central France, and by his observations on the erosion of valleys by rivers, did much to extend and confirm the views of Hutton and Playfair. His remarks, also, on the lamination and cleavage of rocks were highly suggestive; in fact, but for the interruptions of politics, he would have hardly fallen behind his friend Charles Lyell.

During the first half of the nineteenth century, the belief in a universal deluge was widely held by geologists. William Buckland, in his *Reliquiae Diluvianae* (1823), supported his belief by his 'Observations on the Organic Remains contained in Caves, Fissures and Diluvial Gravel.' But, both he and Sedgwick, without giving up the view of a universal flood, abandoned, to some extent, the evidence on which, at one time, they had based their belief.

Another geologist of great eminence was H. T. de la Beche, whose ancestors really did come over with the Normans. His *Geological Manual* was spoken of, at the time, as the best work of its kind which had appeared in our country; and his *Report on the Geology of Cornwall, Devon and West Somerset* (1839) is a masterly production. He occupied himself for a long time in making a geological survey of parts of Devon and Dorset on one-inch ordnance maps, and was appointed, in 1832, by government to conduct the geological survey of England, in which position he superintended the erection of the Jermyn street museum.

The interest of (Sir) Charles Lyell in geology was aroused by



the fascinating lectures of Buckland. He was trained, at first, for the law ; but his legal studies were arrested by a weakness in his eyes, which, for a considerable time, prevented any continuous reading, and troubled him more or less throughout life. But this enforced rest enabled him to devote himself to geology, and, in 1824, he began systematic travel for that purpose. About 1827, his future book—*The Principles of Geology*—began to take a definite shape in his mind. In the spring of that year, with the Murchisons, he visited Auvergne, passing to the south of France and to the north of Italy as far as the Vicentine and the Euganean hills. Thence he went to Naples and Sicily, studying not only their volcanic districts, but, also, the tertiary fossils of other parts of Italy, returning to London after an absence of more than three-quarters of a year. The first volume of *The Principles* appeared in 1831, while he was travelling in France and studying the extinct volcanoes of Olot in Spain, the second volume early in 1832 and the third in 1833. At a later date, the book was divided, the first two volumes retaining the title *Principles*, and the third appearing, in 1838, as *The Elements of Geology*. During these years, he continued his studies of European geology, extending his journeys to Denmark and Scandinavia. In 1841, he began a twelvemonth's journey in Canada and North America, an account of which is given in *Travels in North America*, published early in 1845. The same year he revisited that continent, making a much more extended journey in the United States, which is recounted in his *Second Visit* etc., published in 1849. He returned, for shorter visits, in 1852 and 1853, and, in 1854, went to Madeira and the Canary islands. During the years between 1842 and 1859, he continued his work in various parts of Europe, and, in the latter year, appeared Darwin's *Origin of Species*. The study of this book completed Lyell's conversion to the views expressed by Darwin<sup>1</sup>, and he also investigated the evidence in favour of the early existence of man.

The results of these studies, with an account of the glacial epoch, form the 'trilogy' entitled *The Antiquity of Man*, which appeared early in 1863. After this time, his journeys, necessarily, became shorter, though his interest in geology continued to be as keen as ever, till, after a period of increasing weakness, he died in February 1875.

Henry Clifton Sorby made his mark in more than one department of science, to which a sufficiency of income enabled him to

<sup>1</sup> Prior to that he had been sceptical. See Darwin, *Life and Letters*, vol. II, p. 229.

devote his life ; but he will always be remembered as the father of microscopic petrology. Thin slices of hard bodies had already been made for examination under the microscope ; but Sorby was the first to perceive the value of this method for the examination of rocks in general. In 1849, he made the first transparent section of one with his own hands, publishing his first petrographical study in 1851. In a few years, his example had been followed both in England and in other countries, and the result has been a vast increase in our knowledge of the mineral composition and structures of rocks, and of many difficult problems in their history.

Sir Roderick Impey Murchison was descended from a well-known Scottish clan living in Ross-shire. He was brought up in the army and took part in several of the engagements under Wellesley in Portugal and Moore in Galicia. He was a man of means, and having, at an early date, retired from the army, he occupied himself at first with the active sports of a country gentleman. But, his attention having been turned to science by Sir Humphry Davy, he very soon became an eager and enthusiastic geologist. At first, he especially devoted himself to the rocks of Sussex, Hants and Surrey. Later, he explored the volcanic regions of Auvergne and other parts of France, and of Italy, the Tyrol and Switzerland, and, together with Sedgwick, published much on the geology of the Alps. But it was not till 1831 that Murchison began his real life's work, which was a definite enquiry into the stratification of the rocks on the border of Wales. The result of his labours, published in 1839, was the establishment of the Silurian system and the record of strata older than and different from any that had hitherto been described in these islands. In 1837, he and Sedgwick, by their work in the south-west of England and the Rhineland, established the Devonian system ; and, in 1840, he extended his investigations from Germany to Russia. In the following year, at the desire of the Tsar, he travelled over a considerable part of that country as far as the Ural mountains on the east and the sea of Azov on the south. In 1855, he was appointed director general of the geological survey and director of the museum in Jermyn street, in both of which posts he succeeded Sir Henry de la Beche. Towards the end of his life, he founded a chair of geology and mineralogy at Edinburgh.

William Buckland was, perhaps, better known as a teacher and as an exponent of his science than for any very outstanding original investigation carried on by him in geology. Unlike

Sedgwick, however, he had made a systematic study of his subject before he was appointed, in 1813, reader of mineralogy at Oxford. In this post, he so aroused the interest of his students that a readership in geology was specially endowed by the Treasury six years later, of which he was the first holder. He was a man of many accomplishments, and he by no means confined his attention to geology. He entered with great zest into many practical questions of the day, especially such as affected agriculture and sanitary science. In 1845, he was appointed dean of Westminster, and, shortly after this, his health began to decline.

We have mentioned above that men of science were less specialised at the earlier part of our period than they have now become. It is a peculiar feature of British science that many of its most successful researchers were amateurs—gifted not only with brains but with wealth. Many of those whose names we mention held no kind of professional or academic posts. Even the holding of professorial chairs in the earlier part of the nineteenth century usually involved teaching in more than one science. To the year 1866, the professor of anatomy at Cambridge was responsible for the teaching of zoology as well as for that of anatomy. In many other places, the professorship of zoology was responsible for what teaching there was in animal physiology, and, in the London hospitals, strictly scientific subjects were then taught by doctors in practice who were on the staff of the hospital. It was not till the year 1883 that Michael Foster was appointed to the professorship of physiology at Cambridge, though, as praelector in that subject at Trinity college, he had been building up a great physiological school for several years.

On the zoological side, one of the most productive morphological anatomists of the nineteenth century was Richard Owen, Hunterian professor and, later, conservator of the museum of the Royal college of Surgeons. In 1856, he became superintendent of the natural history branch of the British Museum, and this post he held until 1884. He added greatly to our knowledge of animal structure by his successful dissection of many rare forms, such as the pearly nautilus, *limulus*, *lingula*, *apteryx* and others, and, following on the lines of Cuvier, he was particularly successful in reconstructing extinct vertebrates. Another considerable advance he made in science was the introduction of the terms 'homologous' and 'analogous.' His successor in both his posts, Sir William Flower, an authority on cetacea and on mammals in general, took an active part in arranging the contents of the museums under his

charge in such a way as to teach the intelligent public a lesson in morphology and classification.

Throughout the century, repeated attempts had been made to classify the members of the animal kingdom on a natural basis, but, until their anatomy and, indeed, their embryology had been sufficiently explored, these attempts proved somewhat vain. As late as 1869, Huxley classified sponges with *Protozoa*, *Echinoderms* with *Scolecida* and *Tunicates* with *Polyzoa* and *Brachiopoda*. By the middle of the century, much work had been done in sorting out the animal kingdom on a natural basis, and Vaughan Thompson had already shown that *Flustra* was not a hydroid, but a member of a new group which he named *Polyzoa*. Although hardly remembered now, he demonstrated, by tracing their development, that *Cirripedia* are not molluscs; he established the fact that they began life as free-swimming *Crustacea*; he, again, it was who showed that *Pentacrinus* is the larval form of the feather-star, *Antedon*.

Among marine biologists of eminence was Edward Forbes, who was the first to investigate the distribution of marine organisms at various depths in the sea; and he it was who defined the areas associated with the bathymetrical distribution of marine life, and pointed out that, as we descend into depths below fifty fathoms, vegetable life tends to fade away and that aquatic organisms become more and more modified.

The custom of naturalists to go on long voyages was still maintained. The younger Hooker accompanied Sir James Ross in the 'Erebus' on his voyage in search of the south magnetic pole; Huxley sailed on the 'Rattlesnake' with Owen Stanley, and, on this voyage, laid the foundation of his remarkable knowledge of the structure of marine animals; Darwin sailed on the 'Beagle' (1831—6) and, among the many results of this memorable voyage, was his theory of the structure and origin of coral-reefs. The invention of telegraphy indirectly brought about a great advance in our knowledge of deep-sea fauna. It was necessary to survey the routes upon which the large oceanic cables were to be laid, and, by the inventions of new sounding and dredging instruments, it was becoming possible to secure samples of the bottom fauna as well as of the sub-stratum upon which it existed. Other names that occur in connection with deep-sea dredging are those of Sir Wyville Thomson, of W. B. Carpenter and of J. Gwyn Jeffreys.

But by far the most important and, up to the present time, unrivalled attempt to solve the mysteries of the seas was that of

H.M.S. 'Challenger,' which was despatched by the admiralty at the close of the year 1872, the results of whose voyage have appeared in some eighty quarto volumes. The results of the exploration of the sea by the 'Challenger' have never been equalled. In one respect, however, they were disappointing. It had been hoped that, in the deeper abysses of the sea, creatures whom we only know as geological, fossilised, bony specimens, might be found in the flesh; but, with one or two exceptions—and these of no great importance—such were not found. Neither did any new type of organism appear. Nothing, in fact, was dredged from the depths or found in the tow-net that did not fit into the larger groups which already had been established before the 'Challenger' was thought of. On the other hand, many new methods of research were developed during this voyage, and with it will ever be associated the names of Wyville Thomson, mentioned above, Moseley, John Murray and others who, happily, are still with us.

During the nineteenth century, many other expeditions left Great Britain to explore the natural history of the world, some the result of public, some of private, enterprise. They are too numerous to mention. But a word must be said about the wonderful exploration of central America which has just been completed, under the auspices of F. D. Godman and O. Salvin. The results are incorporated in a series of magnificently illustrated quarto volumes which have been issued during the last thirty-six years. Fifty-two of these relate to zoology, five to botany and six to archaeology. Nearly forty thousand species of animals have been described, of which about twenty thousand are new, and nearly twelve thousand species of plants. There are few remote and partially civilised areas of the world whose zoology and botany are on so secure a basis, and this is entirely owing to the munificence and enterprise of the above mentioned men of science.

With regard to our own shores, one of the features of the latter part of the nineteenth century has been the establishment of marine biological stations, the largest of which is that of the Marine Biological association at Plymouth. The Gatty laboratory at St Andrews, the laboratories at port Erin in the isle of Man, and at Cullercoats, have, also, for many years, been doing admirable work. All these establishments have devoted much technical skill and time to solve fishery and other economical problems connected with our seas.

By far the most important event in the history of biology in the nineteenth century was the publication, in 1859, of *The Origin of Species*. This statement might be strengthened, for the publication of this book changed the whole trend of thought not only in biology, not only in other sciences, but in the whole intellectual outlook of the world. There were, of course, many British evolutionists before Darwin, amongst whom may be mentioned Charles Darwin's grandfather, Erasmus Darwin, Wells, Patrick Matthew, Pritchard, Grant, Herbert—some of these writers even hinted at natural selection. Above all, Robert Chambers, whose *Vestiges of Creation* remained anonymous until after his death, strongly pressed the view that new species of animals were being evolved from simpler types.

During the incubatory period of Darwin's great work, as Alfred Newton has remarked, systematists, both in zoology and botany, had been feeling great searchings of heart as to the immutability of species. There was a general feeling in the air that some light on this subject would shortly appear. As a recent writer has reminded us,

In studying the history of Evolutionary ideas, it is necessary to keep in mind that there are two perfectly distinct lines of thought...*First*. The conviction that species are not immutable, but that, by some means or other, new forms of life are derived from pre-existing ones. *Secondly*. The conception of some process or processes, by which this change of old forms into new ones may be explained<sup>1</sup>.

Now, as we have seen, the first of these lines of thought had been accepted by many writers. Darwin's great merit was that he conceived a process by means of which this evolution in the organic kingdom could be explained.

After his return from the voyage in the 'Beagle,' and after a short residence in London, Darwin, in 1842, settled at the village of Down in Kent, and here it was, he says, 'I can remember the very spot on the road, whilst in my carriage, when to my joy the solution occurred to me.' The 'solution' was 'natural selection by means of the survival of the fittest.' Darwin had written out his views so early as 1842, but he had confided them only to a few, and were it not for a strange coincidence, they might have remained in manuscript even later than 1858.

For, in the spring of 1858, Alfred Russel Wallace, a traveller and explorer who made his living as a collector, was lying sick of fever at Ternate, and his thoughts turned, as Darwin's had done years before, to the writings of Malthus<sup>2</sup>, of Jesus

<sup>1</sup> *The Coming of Evolution*, by Judd, John W., Cambridge, 1912.    <sup>2</sup> *On Population*.

college, Cambridge. The idea of natural selection flashed across his mind. He lost no time in setting it down in writing and in sending it to Darwin by the next post. The story is too well known to repeat here with what mutual magnanimity Wallace and Darwin behaved. Each always gave the other the fullest credit of the inspiration.

The publication of *The Origin of Species* naturally aroused immense opposition and heated controversy. But Darwin was no controversialist. Patient and entirely unresponsive under abuse, he was, at the same time, eager for criticism (knowing that it might advance the truth). His views offended, not only old-fashioned naturalists, but theologians and clerics. Huxley wrote shortly after Darwin's death,

None have fought better, and none have been more fortunate, than Charles Darwin. He found a great truth trodden underfoot, reviled by bigots, and ridiculed by all the world; he lived long enough to see it, chiefly by his own efforts, irrefragably established in science, inseparably incorporated with the common thoughts of men, and only hated and feared by those who would revile, but dare not. What shall a man desire more than this?

Darwin, also, was fortunate in his supporters, though some of the leading biologists of the time—conspicuous among them was Owen—rejected the new doctrine. In Hooker, on the botanical side, in Huxley, on the zoological side, and in Lyell, on the geological side, he found three of the ablest intellects of his country and of his century as champions. None of these agreed on all points with his leader; but all three gave a more than general adherence to his principles and a more than generous aid in promulgating his doctrine. Lyell was an older man, and his *Principles of Geology* had long been a classic. This book inspired students destined to become leaders in the revolution of thought which was taking place in the last half of the nineteenth century. One of these writes:

Were I to assert that if the *Principles of Geology* had not been written, we should never have had the *Origin of Species*, I think I should not be going too far: at all events, I can safely assert, from several conversations I had with Darwin, that he would have most unhesitatingly agreed in that opinion<sup>2</sup>.

Sir Joseph Hooker, whose great experience as a traveller and a systematic botanist, and one who had in his time the widest knowledge of the distribution of plants, was of invaluable assistance to Darwin on the botanical side of his researches. Those who

<sup>1</sup> Huxley, T. H., *Collected Essays*, vol. II, p. 247.

<sup>2</sup> Judd, J. W. *op. cit.*

remember Hooker will remember him as a man of ripe experience, sound judgment and a very evenly balanced mind. But all these high and by no means common qualities were combined with caution, and with a critical faculty which was quite invaluable to Darwin at this juncture. Huxley was of a somewhat different temperament. He was rather proud of the fact that he was named after the doubting apostle; but, whatever Huxley doubted, he never doubted himself. He had clear-cut ideas which he was capable of expressing in the most vigorous and the most cultivated English. Both on platform and on paper he was a keen controversialist. He contributed much to our knowledge of morphology. But never could he have been mistaken for a field-naturalist. In the latter part of his life he was drawn away from pure science by the demands of public duty, and he was, undoubtedly, a power in the scientific world. For he was ever one of that small band in England who united scientific accuracy and scientific training with influence on the political and official life of the country.

It is somewhat curious that the immediate effect of the publication of *The Origin of Species* and of the acceptance of its theories by a considerable and ever-increasing number of experts did not lead to the progress of research along the precise lines Darwin himself had followed. To trace the origin of animals and plants and their interconnection was still the object of zoologists and botanists, but the more active researchers of the last part of the nineteenth century attacked the problem from standpoints in the main other than that of Darwin. The accurate description of bodily structure and the anatomical comparison of the various organs was the subject of one school of investigators: Rolleston's *Forms of Animal Life*, re-edited by Hatchett Jackson, Huxley's *Vertebrate and Invertebrate Zoologies*, and Milnes Marshall's *Practical Zoology* testify to this. Another school took up with great enthusiasm the investigation of animal embryology, the finest output of which was Balfour's *Text-book of Embryology*, published in 1880. Francis Maitland Balfour occupied a chair, especially created for him at Cambridge university, in 1882, and, for a time, Cambridge became a centre for this study, and Balfour's pupil, Sedgwick, carried on the tradition. Members of yet another school devoted themselves to the minute structure of the cell and to the various changes which the nucleus undergoes during cell-division. Animal histology has, however, been chiefly associated with physiology; and, as this chapter is already



greatly overweighted, we have had to leave physiology on one side. The subjects of degeneration, as shown by such forms as the sessile tunicata, the parasitic crustacea and many internal parasitic worms, with the last of which the name of Cobbold is associated, also received attention, and increased interest was shown in the pathogenic influence of internal parasites upon their hosts.

Towards the end of our period, a number of new schools of biological thought arose. As Judd tells us :

Mutationism, Mendelism, Weismannism, Neo-Lamarekism, Biometrics, Eugenics and what not are being diligently exploited. But all of these vigorous growths have their real roots in Darwinism. If we study Darwin's correspondence, and the successive essays in which he embodied his views at different periods, we shall find, variation by mutation (or *per saltum*), the influence of environment, the question of the inheritance of acquired characters and similar problems were constantly present to Darwin's ever open mind, his views upon them changing from time to time, as fresh facts were gathered.

Like everything else, these new theories are deeply rooted in the past.

## CHAPTER IX

### ANGLO-IRISH LITERATURE

THE early classical culture of Ireland, her literary technique in her native Gaelic and the equipment of solid learning that enabled her missionaries to evangelise much of western Europe, have always been a source of puzzled surprise to the modern historian.

Only quite recently has the veil been lifted from this perplexing historical problem. For Zimmer has proved that the remarkable early Irish erudition was due to an exodus of Gaulish scholars into Ireland owing to the devastation of their country by the Huns, Vandals, Goths and Alans. They avoided England, which, at the time, was suffering from continental invasions; they sought Ireland because it was known, through the traders plying between the mouths of the Loire and Garonne and the south and east coasts of Ireland, to be not only a fertile and prosperous country but, also, to be already favourable to the Christian religion. Two circumstances conspired to establish the success of the influx of Gaulish scholars and divines with their precious manuscripts. For they reached Ireland with a learning that, as has been said,

was still to the full extent the best tradition of scholarship in Latin Grammar, Oratory and Poetry, together with a certain knowledge of Greek—in fact the full classical lore of the 4th Century.

They arrived, also, at a time when the Irish were most ready to receive them. For they found native schools of Irish oratory and poetry in which their Brehons or jurists and Filidh (Filé) or poets were being laboriously trained. To use Bede's expression, 'it was not book-Latin but a living speech and a literature in the making that was now heard in many parts of Ireland.'

No wonder, then, that a fusion of Gaelic and classical literature began to take place. Thus, Irish bards fell into the metres of Latin hymns sung in the churches, and introduced final and internal rime, and a regularly recurring number of syllables, into

their native poetry from the Latin; though Sigerson and others would have us believe that rime came into Latin from the Gaels or their kinsmen the Gauls, and that Cicero's famous *O fortunatam natam me Consule Romam* shows this Celtic influence on Latin poetry. Moreover, there was drawn into the Gaelic tongue a form of rhythmic prose to be found in very early Gaelic writings, notably the incantation of Amorgen, known as *rosge*, which still has its counterpart in the Welsh preachers' *hwel* or rhetorical cadence.

So complete a removal, westward, of classical scholarship was thus made in the fourth century that, at the end of the fifth century, Sidonius Apollinaris declares that he knew of but one scholar at Trèves, Argogastis, who could speak and write pure Latin. But the lucky Irish, all this while, were enjoying the full gift of classical learning, and that at a time before scruples had arisen in the minds of professors of Christianity against the study of classics, owing to the pagan doctrines which pervaded them. They, therefore, gave themselves up whole-heartedly to it, and when, as missionaries and scholars, they carried back this classical learning to the continent at the end of the fifth century, they were amazed to find that they and their fellow-countrymen were almost its sole possessors.

The interfusion of the Gaulish classical and Christian and the Gaelic schools of literature, thus early in Irish history, not only made for a singular forbearance towards such pagan themes as are to be found in *The Colloquy of St Patrick with Oisín* (Ossian), but, also, gave to the religious poems of the Irish saints and the curiously free Gaelic translations from Vergil and other classical writings a picturesque individuality which makes them delightful reading.

Gaelic poetry resolves itself roughly into fairy poetry or pagan supernatural poetry, early and later religious poetry, nature poetry, war poetry, love poetry and what may be termed official poetry, i.e. that of the bards as court poets, and as poets attached to the great chieftains whose exploits and nuptials they celebrated and whose dirges they sang; while, here and there, specimens of Irish satirical poetry are to be met throughout the three periods of ancient, middle and later Irish, into which leading scholars are agreed in dividing the works left to us in Irish Gaelic.

The early war poetry does not call for special comment beyond this; as was to have been expected, it largely consists of

laudations of chieftains of a fiercely barbaric kind, and abounds with picturesque descriptive phraseology. Thus, in *Deirdre's Lament over the Sons of Usnagh*, they are variously described as 'three lions from the Hill of the Cave,' 'three dragons of Dun Monidh' and 'three props of the battle-host of Coolney.' But, running through the savage and demonic incidents that characterise the early Irish epics, there is a vein of generosity of one heroic combatant towards another, the desire to fight fair and even to succour a failing enemy, strangely anticipatory of the spirit of medieval chivalry.

Of official poetry, it may be said that its technique is extremely elaborate and, since it was necessary to put as much thought as possible into each self-contained quatrain, its condensations often make very hard sayings of these early *ranns*. A love of, or tendency towards, the supernatural permeates early and middle Irish poetry, as, indeed, it also pervades *The History of Ireland* by Geoffrey Keating, the Irish Herodotus, who wrote as late as 1634; and much of the fascination of Gaelic verse is due to the intrusion of the glamour of 'the other world' into its pages.

Love poetry, among the earliest of its kind in Europe, not only finds poignant expression in such an early Irish poem as *What is Love?*—an expression as definite in its description of the sufferings of a lover as can be found even in Shakespeare's *Sonnets*—but the love lyrics interspersed among Irish prose romances are generally uttered by famous women whose adventures are there described with a passionate purity and tender, delicate feeling rarely met with in the heroines of the Arthurian cycles.

One other characteristic distinguishes old Gaelic poetry from that of contemporary European writers—that love of nature described by Matthew Arnold as natural magic and, according to him, specially characteristic of early and medieval Irish and Welsh poetry. This feature of Gaelic poetry is not only to be noticed in the open air *Fenian Sagas*, but, even in an early hymn to the Virgin, we find her described as:

Branch of Jesse's Tree, whose blossoms  
Scent the heavenly hazel wood!

and

Star of knowledge, rare and noble,  
Tree of many blossoming sprays!

Indeed, the love of nature suffuses all Irish Gaelic poetry.

The bard of early days felt it even among the icy rigours of winter, while the cheerful companionship with nature of the Irish monk

or anchorite is in marked contrast with the fakir-like indifference to her influences of a St Simeon Stylites or the voluntary withdrawal from them of the enclosed Orders of later days. Enough has been said here to suggest that there is much in Irish Gaelic literature, which, if well translated into English verse or prose, might have a stimulative effect upon English letters. Stopford Brooke set himself to prove this by an instructive essay entitled *The Need and Use of getting Irish Literature into the English Tongue*, written three and twenty years ago, in which he showed that there is a vast body of that literature untranslated or inadequately translated, and that very much of it, in good hands, might be so rendered as to prove a substantial gain to English literature.

There has been a considerable response to his appeal, and it is not a little remarkable that, more than a hundred years ago, an early scion of the same literary stock, Charlotte Brooke, daughter of Henry Brooke, the dramatist, had conceived the same view of the importance of recruiting English literature from Irish Gaelic sources, and put it into practice by her own volume of translations from Irish poetry.

Unfortunately, however, the artificial, not to say affected, English verse of her day was about the worst vehicle for the reproduction of the best Gaelic poetry, and the contributors to Hardiman's *Irish Minstrelsy*, which followed her volume, and even later writers in the nineteenth century, were found wanting as effective translators from the Irish. But a new impulse to, and pleasure in, the study of Gaelic poetry was contributed by the vivid versions in kindred English forms of the great Irish prose epics, and of the lyric passages with which they are studded, as well as of the poems of the earlier and later bards wrought by such writers as Edward Walsh and Sir Samuel Ferguson, Mangan and Callanan, Whitley Stokes and Standish Hayes O'Grady, and the editors of the Ossianic society's publications.

A band of contemporary authors, some of whom had already translated many poems, have further answered to the call. This became more easy, owing to the impetus given to the study of Irish by the foundation of the Gaelic league. The Irish Text society was started, and more than a dozen volumes of important English translations from Irish classics have been issued by it. Many translations have been the work of Irishwomen, while further translations of Irish lyric poetry, Irish heroic tales and myths and Irish dramatic poetry have been made. It is only during the last

twenty-five years that the language of this poetry has been carefully studied, and later scholars have had the advantage over their predecessors in being able to introduce with great effect reminiscences of the characteristic epithets and imagery which formed a large part of the stock-in-trade of the medieval bard.

We have indicated that the interesting individual character of early Irish literature makes it worth while getting that literature more fully represented in the English language through translation, adaptation and the use of Irish themes in original English writings. It may be desirable to point out here that, when Irish literature had a wider recognition in Britain and on the continent than it now commands, it thus found its way into European and Welsh and, therefrom, into English literature. The Anglo-Norman conquerors of Ireland, no doubt, clung to their French prose and verse romances, and the native Irish chieftains were as conservative of their native hero tales and poems. Yet, as E. C. Quiggin well puts it,

few serious scholars will be prepared to deny that the Island contributed in considerable measure to the common literary stock of the Middle ages. In the literature of vision, very popular in Ireland, a chord was struck which continued to vibrate powerfully until the time of the reformation, and *The Vision of Tundale* (Tnudgal), written with striking success by an Irishman named Marcus at Regensburg about the middle of the twelfth century, was probably known to Dante, and, in addition to the numerous continental versions, there is a rendering of its story into middle English verse.

Apart from its visions, there is a section of Irish Gaelic literature known as that of *imrama* or voyages. The earliest romance of the kind is the voyage of Maeldun, to Joyce's translation of which, in his *Old Celtic Romances*, the writer of this chapter called Tennyson's attention. Hence the appearance of Tennyson's wellknown poem. A still more famous Irish *imram* is *The Voyage of St Brendan*, which passed through all the Christian continent and, therefore, as Quiggin points out, 'figures in *The South English Legendary*.' 'The episode of St Brendan and the Whale, moreover, was probably the ultimate source of one of Milton's best known similes in his description of Satan.' But the legend of St Brendan, as told in Irish literature, differs both from the Latin version and from those of France and Germany. Matthew Arnold's poem is based on these foreign versions and introduces the incident of Judas Iscariot being allowed out of hell for one day in the year, because of an act of humanity when on earth.

The question is still vexed as to how far the characteristics of Arthurian legends are due to their being possessed in common by

the Irish and the Welsh, or to Irish influences over Welsh romantic literature dating back to the days of Gruffydd ap Cynan. He was the son of an Irish princess, who had spent much of his life as an exile in Ireland and, on his return to Wales, undoubtedly brought with him Irish bards and *shenachies*, who through their superior literary knowledge and technique and musical skill, greatly advanced the Cymric culture of his day.

But it now seems fairly certain, in the opinion of Windisch and other Celtic scholars, including Quiggin, that

some of the Welsh rhapsodists apparently served a kind of apprenticeship with their Irish brethren, and many things Irish were assimilated at this time which, through this channel, were shortly to find their way into Anglo-French. Thus it may now be regarded as certain that the name of the 'fair sword,' Excalibur, by Geoffrey called Caliburnus (Welsh *Caletfwlch*) is taken from Caladbolg, the far famed broadsword of Fergus Mac Roig. It does not appear that the whole frame-work of the Irish sagas was taken over, but, as Windisch points out, episodes were borrowed as well as tricks of imagery. So, to mention but one, the central incident of Syr Gawayn and the Grene Knyght is doubtless taken from the similar adventure of Cuchulain in Bricriu's Feast. Thus, the share assigned to Irish influence in the *matière de Bretagne* is likely to grow with the progress of research<sup>1</sup>.

Matthew Arnold considers Shakespeare full of Celtic magic in his handling of nature, and makes a fine discrimination between his Greek and Celtic nature notes; but whence did he come by the latter? Was it, at second hand, through Edmund Spenser, or his friend Dowland the lutenist, who, if not an Irishman, had an Irish association, or was his mother, Mary Arden, who came from the Welsh border, and whose distant kinsfolk were connected with the Welsh Tudor court, of Cymric blood? For the Celtic note is there. But, while Shakespeare describes Welsh character brilliantly, in three special types, those of Glendower, Fluellen and Sir Hugh Evans, he only sketches one feather-headed Irishman, records not a single Irish incident in any of his plays and only makes a few passing allusions to kerns and gallowglasses, and to the marvellous powers of prophecy and of riming rats to death claimed by Irish bards, while he weaves into his musical and lyrical framework perhaps half a dozen Irish airs and but a couple of references to Irish folk-lore—if, indeed, his queen Mab is the Irish queen Medb and his Puck is the Irish Puca, whose gambols and appearance are very similar to Puck's.

Probably, Shakespeare was not unnaturally prejudiced against the Irish, with whom, for much of his life, his country was at war, and whom Spenser had described in unflattering terms, and at

<sup>1</sup> 'Irish Influence on English Literature,' Quiggin, E. C., in *The Glories of Ireland*.

whose hands he and Essex and other Englishmen with whom Shakespeare must have been in intellectual sympathy had suffered much. Spenser's own writings, also, suggest that, although his *Faerie Queene*, largely written on the banks of the southern Blackwater, has its scenery as a background in book v and elsewhere, the bardic poetry which he had caused to be translated for him, and which, in his opinion, was 'of sweet wit and good invention,' made no personal appeal to him. Indeed, considering how savagely hostile it was to his countrymen, as he declares, it was not likely to have had any further effect upon him.

To what must we attribute the literary silence of the English-speaking settlers in Ireland from the end of the twelfth to the close of the sixteenth century? The causes are threefold. Irish and Latin, for the mass of the inhabitants of Ireland, were their written and spoken languages, and writers in English would have had a very small hearing. Constant wars with the native Irish, and a very precarious hold upon their property, made the pursuit of English letters almost out of the question with the Anglo-Irish of the Pale. Finally, the remarkable tendency of the Anglo-Norman and Englishman to become, in course of time, more Irish than the Irish, owing to intermarriage and fosterage and separation from their kinsfolk in England and Wales, drew them away from English and Welsh into Irish-Gaelic literature.

With the exception, therefore, of merely technical books such as John Garland's *Organum*, a musical treatise in Latin, and Lionel Power's first English treatise on music, in 1395, no Anglo-Irish literary works are to be noted till we reach Stanyhurst's *Description of Ireland*, together with part of a history of Ireland, written, under the direction of Edmund Campion the Jesuit, for Holinshed's *Chronicles*, published in 1578<sup>1</sup>.

Works by Anglo-Irish writers of the seventeenth century are largely in Latin and, therefore, are not dealt with here. A reference to the bibliography of this chapter will, however, show that a few of these have been rendered into English and should be consulted, in this or in their original form, by students interested in Irish history, archaeology and hagiology, secular and religious, and in the treatment of these subjects by such distinguished contemporary writers as John Colgan, Sir James Ware—whom archbishop Ussher had educated into an interest in Irish history and antiquities—Luke Wadding and Philip O'Sullivan Beare. These, too, were the times of Geoffrey Keating, the first writer of modern

<sup>1</sup> See, *ante*, vol. III, p. 319.



Irish who can claim to possess literary style, and of the O'Clery family. Keating was a poet as well as a historian, and his lyric *Geoffrey Keating to his Letter on its way to Ireland* is one of the most charming of Irish patriotic poems. Keating's *History of Ireland* has been recently issued by the Irish Text society, with an excellent English translation facing the original Irish, and *Annals of the Four Masters* may also be consulted in a satisfactory English version.

But the first seventeenth century writer whose works are familiar to contemporary Englishmen was James Ussher, one of the first students of Trinity college, Dublin, afterwards archbishop of Armagh and primate of Ireland, who, without doubt, was one of the most remarkable of Irish scholars, being, according to Selden, *ad miraculum doctus*. He wrote in English as well as in Latin, and, moreover, was an Irish scholar. He discovered the long lost *Book of Kells*, a MS of the four Gospels, the finest specimen of Irish illuminated art in existence, and, indeed, unparalleled for beauty by any other work of the kind, and he bequeathed it, with the rest of his books and MSS, to Trinity college, Dublin, in 1661. His writings are mainly concerned with theological or controversial subjects, which had a great vogue in his days. But his *opus magnum* is *Annales Veteris et Novi Testamenti*, a chronological compendium in Latin of the history of the world from the Creation to the dispersion of the Jews under Vespasian, which brought him European fame. Ussher's specially Irish works are mentioned in the bibliography.

Passing to later centuries, we shall find few instances of a hereditary talent so persistent as that of the Sheridan stock. Richard Brinsley Sheridan himself inherited poetic tastes from his mother, born Frances Chamberlaine, from his father Thomas Sheridan, a noted actor and playwright, his dramatic bent, and from his grandfather, Thomas Sheridan, Swift's intimate, a classical style. His own brilliant wit descended to his son Tom Sheridan, father of Caroline Sheridan, afterwards Mrs Norton<sup>1</sup> (the supposed prototype of George Meredith's *Diana of the Crossways*), and, also, of Helen Sheridan, lady Dufferin. From the Sheridan stock, too, descends the Le Fanu talent; for Alice, Richard Brinsley Sheridan's sister, a clever writer of verse and plays, was grandmother of Joseph Sheridan Le Fanu, while Sheridan Knowles, the popular actor and dramatist, was, also, of the Sheridan-Le Fanu stock. Caroline Norton does

<sup>1</sup> See, *ante*, vol. XIII, chap. VI.

not escape the influence of the sentimentality which marked the verse of her time, as her sister lady Dufferin escapes it. The simplest themes seemed to attract lady Dufferin most. Living a happy domestic life amid Irish surroundings, her warm heart beats in such close sympathy with her peasant neighbours that, in *I'm sitting on the stile, Mary*, and *The Bay of Dublin*, she writes as if she were one of themselves, while her sense of fun floats through her Irish poems with a delicate breeziness.

A writer of the Sheridan blood nearer to present day literary tastes than James Sheridan Knowles<sup>1</sup> was Joseph Sheridan Le Fanu, Sheridan's great grand-nephew. T. W. Rolleston does not say too much in Le Fanu's praise as a master of the mysterious and terrible when he thus writes of him :

In *Uncle Silas*, in his wonderful tales of the supernatural, such as *The Watcher*, and in a short and less known but most masterly story, *The Room in the Dragon Volant*, he touched the springs of terror and suspense, as perhaps no other writer of fiction in the language has been able to do. His fine scholarship, poetic sense, and strong, yet delicate handling of language and of incident give these tales a place quite apart among works of sensational fiction. But perhaps the most interesting of all his novels is *The House by the Churchyard*, a wonderful admixture of sentimentalism, humour, tragedy, and romance.

To this may be added the belief that, in Le Fanu's verse and, notably, in his drama *Beatrice*, the qualities above indicated are often conveyed with a finer touch, and, at times, with extraordinary directness of suggestion. Again, the lurid terror of his poetical narratives is happily relieved by interludes of such haunting beauty of colour and sound, that we cannot but lament the lateness of this discovery of his highest artistic self. Indeed, our literature can ill afford to lose lyrical dramas with such a stamp of appalling power upon them as is impressed on *Beatrice*, or old-world idylls so full of Gaelic glamour as *The Legend of the Glaive*, or so terrible a confession by a drunkard of how he had fallen irrevocably into the toils of the enchantress drink as *The Song of the Bottle* and such stirring Irish ballads as *Shamus O'Brien* and *Phaudrig Crohoore*.

William Drennan was one of the founders and the literary champion of 'The Society of United Irishmen'; for his *Letters of Orellana* drew a large number of Ulstermen into its ranks, while his fine lyrics *The Wake of William Orr* and *Erin*, admired by Moore, earned him the title 'The Tyrtæus of the United Irishmen.'

<sup>1</sup> See, *ante*, vol. XIII, chap. VIII.

Mary Tighe, born Blachford—notable, like Mrs Hemans, for her beauty, poetical talent and unhappy marriage—was the authoress of *Psyche*, adapted from the story of Cupid and Psyche in *The Golden Ass* of Apuleius—a long, harmonious, fanciful and unaffected poem, in the Spenserian stanza, which had a wide circulation in its day, influenced the work of Keats and won Moore's praise in his lyric *Tell me the witching Tale again*.

With the later years of the eighteenth century begins that period in Anglo-Irish literature when the brief but brilliant era of Irish parliamentary independence gave an impulse to literature, art and music in Ireland which survived the passing of the Act of union for quite a generation. Apart from the patriotic poems of Drennan and such national folk-ballads as *The Shan van Vocht*, and *The Wearing of the Green*, and the brilliant oratory of Grattan, Flood and Curran—there was a revival of interest in Irish native poetry and music, evidenced by the publication of Charlotte Brooke's *Reliques of Irish Poetry*, the holding of the Granard and Belfast meetings of Irish harpers and the consequent issue of Bunting's first and second collections of *Ancient Irish Music*, which inspired Moore's *Irish Melodies*. Magazines began to appear in Dublin, Belfast and Cork, which gave employment to Irish men and women of letters. Learned societies sprang up and flourished. Schools of art were founded and state-aided popular education succeeded the hedge-schools. But these movements were interrupted and marred by intermittent political agitations, and Dublin lost more and more of its prestige as a capital. The writers, artists and musicians who would have rallied around the leaders of an independent Ireland were gradually led to seek their living in London; and, for the same reasons, the mental vitality they had showed at the end of the previous century declined even more decidedly in Belfast, Cork and Limerick.

Two groups of Irish patriots, however, the one more purely political, the other, owing to race, less actively so, conferred literary credit upon Ireland even at a time when she was suffering from unsatisfactory land laws and the imposition of a poor law contrary to the character of her people.

One of these groups, the Young Irelanders, carried on its literary propaganda very much as a protest against what they regarded as the continuous misgovernment of their country; the other group remained faithful to literary efforts for Ireland in spite of the existing condition of the country; and, thus, though in a large measure opposed to one another in politics, the two bodies

worked side by side, more especially in universities and learned societies.

George Petrie, a distinguished artist, archaeologist, musician and man of letters, and a man of as much personal charm as versatility of talent, drew around him the most eminent of the non-political group of Irish writers referred to, in association with Caesar Otway, who, somewhat late in life, discovered literary gifts of a high order which he employed in writings descriptive of Irish life, scenery and historic remains. He started *The Dublin Penny Journal* and conducted it with spirit and marked ability for a year, and, ten years later, *The Irish Penny Journal*, which he carried on, this time as sole editor, with equal enthusiasm and skill for the same short period. The physician William Stokes, whose *Biography of George Petrie* is a standard Irish work of its kind, is, however, constrained to say, that, though, next to politics and polemics, the subjects treated of in these two illustrated magazines, namely, the history, biography, poetry, antiquities, natural history, legends and traditions of the country, were most likely to attract the attention of the Irish people, yet,

there is no more striking evidence of the absence of public opinion or the want of interest in the history of the country on the part of Irish society than the failure of these two works, and it is remarkable that the principal demand for them was from London and the provincial towns of England. In literary merit, they were anything but failures and, indeed, it is told of Southey, that he used to say, when talking of these volumes, that he prized them as among the most valuable of his library.

The Irish writers who deserved this favourable verdict from Southey were Carleton and the Banims, Crofton Croker, Mrs S. C. Hall, Anster, Martin Doyle, Wills, D'Alton and Furlong.

Besides Petrie himself, author of two archaeological works—*Origin and uses of the Round Towers* and *Essay on Tara Hill*—each a masterpiece of scientific reasoning, and of a series of descriptive articles relating to Clonmacnoise, the isles of Arran and other places of Irish antiquarian and other interests, which possess a charm as delicate and wistful as his Welsh and Irish water-colour paintings, we find ourselves in the company of Otway, of whom Archer Butler has well said :

Among all the panegyrists of Irish natural beauty, none has ever approached him. You are not, indeed, to expect much method or system in his sketches, but he had a higher and rarer gift. He was possessed by what he saw and felt. His imagination seemed to revel in the sublimities he described: his sentences became breathing pictures, better, because more suggestive, than painting itself.

And now we may hark back a little to the writers who, after qualifying for the task in *Maga* and other British magazines, were to establish and carry on for a long season the brilliant *Dublin University Magazine*. First and foremost of these was William Maginn<sup>1</sup>. This was the time when Lamb, De Quincey, Lockhart and Wilson were giving most of their writings to magazines, and Maginn proceeded to follow their example. His classical scholarship gave him style, to which he added remarkable versatility of literary power. It is said that he conceived the idea of the famous *Noctes Ambrosianae* and wrote many of these dialogues. He was the author of such brilliantly humorous, if truculent and devil-may-care, verses as *The Irishman and the Lady* and *St Patrick*; while, among his satiric writings, his panegyric of colonel Pride may stand comparison even with Swift's notable philippics; and his Sir Morgan O'Doherty was the undoubted ancestor of Maxwell's and Lever's hard-drinking, practical-joking Irish military heroes. Maginn, no doubt, suggested to William Hamilton Maxwell, another Trinity college graduate, the idea of laying himself out to write military novels; hence, his *Stories of Waterloo*. Maxwell was a great sportsman, if a poor parson, and his *Wild Sports of the West of Ireland* enjoyed a great, and, in the opinion of 'Christopher North,' a deserved, popularity.

Charles Lever, as a young man, sat at Maxwell's feet, but soon surpassed his master in popularity as a writer of the new form of fiction originated by Maginn. He, too, was educated at Trinity college, Dublin, and took a medical degree there and also at Louvain, as did Goldsmith; and, like him, for a while practised the healing art. Most of his earlier work, like that of Maxwell, appeared in *The Dublin University Magazine*, which he edited when it was in its prime, and, here, his spirited and brilliant, if somewhat rough and ready, military novels first saw the light. In his later years, when he was consul at Trieste, his more finished, if less popular, works, *Cornelius O'Dowd* and *Lord Kilgobbin*, a novel of Fenian times, appeared. In verse as in prose, Lever has a lighter and more human touch than Maginn, without his masterfulness of style. But he does not escape from the somewhat selfish atmosphere in which the hard-drinking, hard-riding squires and squireens of his day had their being.

Samuel Lover, a protestant Irishman, took a stand against

<sup>1</sup> See, *ante*, vol. XII, chap. VI.

the Irish verse of his day and made a study, if not a deep one, of his catholic compatriots. Lover has always been compared with Lever, by whom, however, as a recent writer in *The Quarterly Review* justly says,

he was overshadowed. Yet, within his limited sphere, he was a true humourist, and the careless whimsical, illogical aspects of Irish character have seldom been more effectively illustrated than by the author of *Handy Andy* and *The Gridiron*. Paddy, as drawn by Lever, succeeds in spite of his drawbacks, much as Brer Rabbit does in the tales of Uncle Remus. Lover's heroes 'liked action but they hated work'; the philosophy of thriftlessness is summed up to perfection in *Paddy's Pastoral Rhapsody*:

Here's a health to you, my darlin'  
Though I'm not worth a farthin';  
For when I'm drunk I think I'm rich,  
I've a feather-bed in every ditch.

Still, it must be conceded that Lover made a strong step forward as a writer of national songs and stories, even though he cannot be held to possess the style and glamour that characterises some latter day Irish novelists and poets.

The treatment of national stories was first raised to the level of an art by Crofton Croker, in his *Fairy Legends and Traditions of Ireland*, first published, anonymously, in 1825—a set of folk-tales full of literary charm. For, just as Moore took Irish airs, touched them up and partnered them with lyrics to suit what was deemed to be British and Irish taste, so Croker gathered his folk-tales from the Munster peasantry with whom he was familiar and, assisted by literary friends, including Maginn (who is credited by D. J. O'Donoghue with the authorship of that humorous pearl of great price *Daniel O'Rourke*), gave them exactly the form and finish needful to provide the reading public of his day with a volume of fairy lore.

William Carleton and the brothers John and Michael Banim followed Crofton Croker with what Douglas Hyde rightly describes as folklore tales of an incidental and highly manipulated type. William Carleton, one of the most remarkable of Irish writers, was born at Prillisk, county Tyrone, the youngest of the fourteen children of a poor peasant. His father was not only a man of amazing memory, but a walking chronicle of old tales, legends and historical anecdotes, which he loved to recount to his children, and with which he delighted his son William. His mother, too, was specially gifted; for she had a beautiful voice and sang old Irish songs and ballads with great charm. He was intended for the Roman catholic ministry, but his parents were too

poor to afford him an education at Maynooth, and, therefore, he passed his time in desultory reading until he secured the appointment of tutor in the family of a well-to-do farmer. Tired of this employment, he made his way to Dublin and, after many vicissitudes, obtained employment from Caesar Otway on his periodical *The Christian Examiner*. To this, he contributed thirty sketches of Irish peasant life, which were collected and published (1832) in a volume entitled *Traits and Stories of the Irish Peasantry*.

Carleton, at the time, was thirty-six years of age; but the success of his book was great and immediate. A second series appeared in 1833, and a kindred volume, *Tales of Ireland*, was issued in 1834. Some of these sketches and stories appeared in *The Dublin Penny Journal* as before stated, and later contributions of the kind in *The Irish Penny Journal*. These stories and sketches, which had a great vogue, are perfectly faithful to the Irish peasant life they depicted, and, for their sudden and surprising alternation of wild humour and profound melancholy, are a unique contribution to folk literature. Challenged by critics who doubted his being able to give the world anything but brief disconnected tales, he replied with *Fardorougha the Miser*, an extraordinarily powerful, if sombre, story of a man whose soul is divided between passion for money and deep affection for an only son. The women's characters as well as the men's are finely conceived. Other, less successful, novels by Carleton are *Valentine McClutchy* and *The Black Prophet*. He left behind him an unpublished story, *Anne Cosgrave*, which contains some remarkable chapters, but which was written when he was in feeble health and broken spirits caused by family bereavement. But he will be best remembered by his descriptions of Irish peasant life, at an unsophisticated period, rather than by his humorous folk-tales, which, though extremely clever, lack the literary touch given to kindred work by Maginn, Crofton Croker and, it may be added, Patrick Kennedy.

Patrick Kennedy was, indeed, a genuine writer of Irish folk-tales. His *Legendary Fictions of the Irish Celt* and *Fireside Stories of Ireland*, *Bardic Stories of Ireland*, *Evenings in the Duffrey* and *Banks of the Boro'* were put on paper much as he heard them when a boy in his native county Wexford, when they had already passed, with little change in the telling, from Gaelic into the peculiar Anglo-Irish local dialect which is distinctly west-Saxon in its character. Kennedy is a true story-teller, animated and humorous, but not extravagantly so, like Carleton and Lover at times; indeed, his artistic restraint is remarkable.

Francis Sylvester Mahony, better known as Father Prout, was born in Cork in 1804. Ordained as a Jesuit, he became a master at Clongowes college and, when there, began to write for English magazines and journals—*Fraser's Magazine*, where the first of the celebrated *Reliques* in prose and verse appeared with the afterwards wellknown signature 'Father Prout P.P. of Watergrasshill, Co. Cork'; *The Daily News*, to which he contributed a series of letters, as Roman correspondent, under the designation 'Don Jeremy Savonarola'; *Bentley's Miscellany* and *The Cornhill*. Afterwards, he became Paris correspondent of *The Globe*, of which he was part proprietor. He died in Paris in 1866. A learned and witty essayist and a brilliant versifier in English and Latin, he had the audacity to turn some of Moore's *Irish Melodies* into Latin verse and then claim that his translations were the originals. He is now, however, most remembered by *The Bells of Shandon* and a droll imitation of an Irish hedge-school ballad, entitled *The Sabine Farmer's Serenade*.

The brothers Banim, John and Michael, are best known by their joint work *Tales of the O'Hara Family*—one brother passing on his work to the other for suggestions and criticism. Their several gifts, as shown in their popular Irish tales, are in pleasant contrast.

'John's,' writes Katharine Tynan, 'was the stronger and more versatile, Michael's the more humane and sunshiny. John's, occasionally in a page of dark tragedy, recalls that grinding melancholy of Carleton, which is almost squalid. It is a far cry from *Father Connell* to *The Nowlans*; in fact, the two stories represent almost the extremes of human temperament. Michael's was the gentler and more idealising nature, though no one should deny tenderness to the author of *Soggarth Aroon* and *Aileen*.'

No doubt, John Banim's work was coloured by the melancholy from which he suffered, due, in the first instance, to the death of his betrothed, and, also, to a somewhat morbid temperament. Through the influence of his friend Sheil, he produced a successful tragedy *Damon and Pythias* at Covent garden, and wrote a series of clever essays *Revelations of the Dead*, satires on the follies and affectations of the day, which were much read at the time. Michael Banim was the best of brothers. Quite apart from the modest manner in which he held back from claiming his share in the popularity gained by John, through the success of *The Tales of the O'Hara Family*, he begged him, when news came of his failing health, to return with his wife from his work to Kilkenny and make his home there with him, insisting that 'one brother should not want while the other can supply him.' Though



the elder, Michael outlived John by thirty years, during which period he produced *Father Connell*, one of his best novels, *Clough Fion* and *The Town of The Cascades*.

We may here revert to the group of Irish writers who made national Irish politics the vehicle for their literary propaganda and, wise in their generation, thus secured a far wider hearing than Petrie and Otway gained by means of their three magazines. Thomas Osborne Davis, the son of parents of strictly unionist principles, and with but little Irish blood in his veins, went, as a protestant, to Trinity college, Dublin, but then began to show his independence of mind. He did not lay himself out for college distinction, which he could easily have gained, but read omnivorously, won influence with his fellow-students and, ultimately, became president of the Historical society, the leading university debating-club. Called to the bar, he began to practise in the revision courts and to dabble in political journalism. This latter work attracted the attention of Charles Gavan Duffy, the brilliant young editor of a Belfast national journal, and a Roman catholic. The two men became friends, and a walk taken by them and John Blake Dillon in Phoenix park led to the establishment of *The Nation*, from which sprang what was soon known as 'The Young Ireland Movement,' and which, as Duffy afterwards wrote, 'profoundly influenced the mind of his own generation and made a permanent change in the opinion of the nation.'

At first, Davis, who was joint editor of *The Nation*, with Duffy, was opposed to the introduction of verse into this journal. Afterwards, however, he recognised how readily his countrymen would respond to this kind of appeal; and, in the third and sixth numbers of the paper, respectively, there appeared two of his finest political lyrics *My Grave* and his *Lament for Owen Roe O'Neill*. Thereafter, he wrote much verse in *The Nation*, little of it, however, deserving the name of poetry. Nor was this surprising. He had not time to polish his lines; besides, he wrote for 'the enlightenment and regeneration of the people,' and his verse, therefore, tended to become didactic. Yet, in his few leisure hours, when he could carefully think out and finish a poem, or when he was under the inspiration of an ardent personal patriotism, he was a true poet—as in his *Boatman of Kinsale*, *O the Marriage, the Marriage* and his historical ballad *The Sack of Baltimore*. But Davis will further be remembered by his essays. Gavan Duffy, also, broke into spirited, unaffected verse in *The Nation*: witness his

*Lay Sermon, The Irish Chief, Innishowen* and *The Patriot's Bride*. But there were two other constant contributors to *The Nation* who excelled both him and Davis in poetic craft—Denis Florence MacCarthy and Thomas D'Arcy M'Gee. One of MacCarthy's finest poems is in honour of the clan MacCaura, of which he came, and his lyrics *The Pillar Towers of Ireland* and *Waiting for the May* have become popular—the first, deservedly so; the latter, in spite of its somewhat sickly cast of thought. His translations of Calderon's dramas are accepted as standard works of the kind; while his *Shelley's Early Life from original sources* is interesting as showing what that poet's efforts were for the amelioration of the government of Ireland.

Thomas D'Arcy M'Gee was the most considerable of *The Nation* poets. He visited America at the age of seventeen, and, two years later, became editor of *The Boston Pilot*, but, meanwhile, the echo of a brilliant speech made by him reached O'Connell across the Atlantic, and led to the offer of a post on *The Freeman's Journal*, which he accepted, but, afterwards, abandoned in favour of more congenial work, under Duffy, in *The Nation*. There is a mystical splendour about his most remarkable poem *The Celts*, contributed to its pages; and his patriotic poems *I left two loves on a distant strand*, *My Irish Wife* and *Home Thoughts* deserve remembrance as does *The Sea-divided Gaels*, which might serve as a pan-Celtic anthem. His career was remarkable. Concerned in the Irish rebellion of '48, and with a price set on his head, he again found a home in the United States, started the *New York Nation*, and, afterwards, at Boston, *The American Celt*. Meanwhile, his political views underwent much modification. He passed into Canada, entered the Canadian parliament and so distinguished himself there that he became Canadian minister of agriculture. But he so completely abandoned his revolutionary, in favour of constitutional, views on the subject of Irish grievances that he incurred the bitter hostility of the Fenians, and, on denouncing their agitation, was assassinated.

Richard D'Alton Williams, author of *The Munster War Song*, lady Wilde ('Speranza'), who wrote remarkable rhetorical verses upon the Irish potato famine, and John Kells Ingram, author of the immortal *Who fears to speak of Ninety-Eight?*, who ended his life as vice-provost of Trinity college, Dublin, are other poets of *The Nation* movement to be had in remembrance.

But the most remarkable poet connected with *The Nation*, as a contributor to it of fine rhetorical verse and several noble

laments, was James Mangan or James Clarence Mangan, as he had renamed himself. The son, like Thomas Moore, of a Dublin grocer and, like him, destined to write Irish national lyrics of great beauty and oriental poems of a very striking character and with a vein of satiric whimsicality as delicate, Mangan's life was as conspicuous a failure as Moore's was a signal success. Moore had a happy home in childhood, Mangan a most unhappy one; and so it happened that, at the age of fifteen, when his great promise as a schoolboy should have been inducing his father to give him those continued educational advantages which lifted young Moore to honour and affluence, his wrong-headed generosity and credulity was bringing his household to ruin till his brilliant boy was withdrawn from school to help to support his broken-down parents by monotonous drudgery at a scrivener's desk, in rude and unsympathetic company. Nor did Mangan's character enable him to fight his way up in the world when he had only himself to care for. A victim to 'red rum' or opium or both, he struggled on as an occasional contributor in verse or a hack writer in prose to evanescent journals like *The Comet* and *The Dublin Penny Journal* or as temporary clerk in various Dublin attorneys' offices and under the Irish Ordnance Survey.

Patriotic and devotional verse and a certain amount of rough and ready translation from the Irish, for the supply of the very necessities of life, occupied Mangan's closing days and he finally fell a victim to the cholera which succeeded the famine of 1846, whose horrors are reflected in his *New Year's Lay*, his last fine effort in verse.

The vogue for German literature, largely attributable to Carlyle's influence, made good translations from the German poets most acceptable in his day; and this special need was Mangan's opportunity as a sympathetic student of these authors and now a considerable master of verse. He availed himself of this opportunity to the full and at first quite seriously. In the rare instances where the character of the original lent itself to literal translation into English he so rendered it with superlative skill, but he was an adapter rather than a translator.

A tendency to edit and improve his German originals grew upon him. He found that the occasional lapses of the minor German poets into dullness and sentimentality would not have suited his readers, so he improved and improved them, as his stock for translation, which had become his 'daily bread,' deteriorated until he improved them almost entirely away and

finally began to publish, as poems from the German of 'Dreschler' and 'Selber' and other non-existent authors, lyrics of his own, more or less influenced by his German studies.

When remonstrated with by Dr Anster for thus depriving himself of the credit of such fine original work as was contained in a sham translation of Hafiz, he replied, 'Any one could see it was only Half-his.'

But, whatever their origin, there is no doubt of the rare poetical quality of some of Mangan's so-called eastern poems, such as *The Karamanian Exile*, *Gone in the Wind* and *The Howling Song of Al Mohara*. Through them runs an art-effect with which he anticipated Edgar Allan Poe, namely that modern adaptation of the refrain which consists of repeating it with musical variations, and this beautiful effect is found at its finest in his greatest poem, *Dark Rosaleen*<sup>1</sup>, perhaps the most memorable Anglo-Irish poem ever written. This alone would have won him immortality, but a few others of his Irish poems—the *Lament for Banba*, the *Vision of Connaught in the Thirteenth Century*, his version of O'Hussey's *Ode to the Maguire* and his desolate *Siberia*—make his fame as an Irish poet absolutely secure.

<sup>1</sup> Over hills and through dales  
Have I roamed for your sake;  
All yesterday I sailed with sails  
On river and on lake.  
The Erne, at its highest flood,  
I dashed across unseen,  
For there was lightning in my blood,  
My dark Rosaleen!  
My own Rosaleen!  
Oh! there was lightning in my blood,  
Red lightning lightened through my blood,  
My dark Rosaleen!

All day long, in unrest,  
To and fro do I move.  
The very soul within my breast  
Is wasted for you, love!  
The heart in my bosom faints  
To think of you, my Queen,  
My life of life, my saint of saints,  
My dark Rosaleen!  
My own Rosaleen!  
To hear your sweet and sad complaints,  
My life, my love, my saint of saints,  
My dark Rosaleen!

Stanzas 2, 3.

Meanwhile, Davis had died at a tragically early age, and Duffy, after carrying on *The Nation* till its suppression on political grounds and reviving it again, sought and found a new field for his energies in Australia. Here he rose to be premier of Victoria, was knighted and returned to this country to found the Irish literary societies of London and Dublin, and to edit *The New Irish Library*, thus taking a prominent part in what is now known as the Irish literary renaissance.

Sheil possessed remarkable literary as well as oratorical gifts<sup>1</sup>. He wrote half-a-dozen tragedies, two of which, *The Apostate* and *Evadne or the Statue*, were produced with marked success at Covent garden, Eliza O'Neill, Kemble and Macready being included in the cast of the first of these plays. He also wrote, for *The New Monthly Magazine*, *Sketches of the Irish Bar*, in conjunction with W. H. Curran. These became popular and were afterwards republished. John Philpot Curran, the orator, was a witty and graceful writer of verse, and his *Deserter's Meditation*, and *Cushla ma Chree* have caught the Irish popular fancy and are still often sung and recited. Samuel, afterwards Sir Samuel, Ferguson, came into notice as a poet by the appearance of his *Forging of the Anchor* contributed to *Blackwood* when he was but twenty-one, in May 1832; a little later, *The Return of Claneboy*, a prose romance which also appeared in *Maga*, may be regarded, to quote himself, as 'the first indication of my ambition to raise the native elements of Irish history to a dignified level.' 'This ambition,' he adds, 'I think may be taken as the key to almost all the literary work of my subsequent life.' But, while casting about for nobler themes to work upon than were to be found in Irish bardic and peasant poems, finely rendered by him into English verse in the pages of *The Dublin University Magazine*, he wrote his elegy *Thomas Davis*, 1845, a poignant expression of his grief at the death of the famous young nationalist leader. This poem was not included in his published works, and appeared for the first time in *Sir Samuel Ferguson in the Ireland of his day*, a biography of her husband, by lady Ferguson, born Mary Guinness, who had previously written an interesting *Story of Ireland before the English Conquest*, finely illustrated by passages from Sir Samuel's heroic poems.

The elegy on Davis certainly shows Ferguson at his highest as a lyric poet, and is rightly described by Gavan Duffy as 'the most Celtic in structure and spirit, of all the poetical tributes to the lost leader.' Ferguson was held back from his higher literary work

<sup>1</sup> See, *ante*, chap. II.

by the exigencies of the Irish potato famine and expressed his feelings at its mismanagement in verse full of bitter invective ; but he lived to turn his fine satiric gift against the successors of the Young Ireland poets and patriots, with whom he had sympathised, when he found them descending to what he characterised as 'a sordid social war of classes carried on by the vilest methods.' In his satiric poems *At the Polo Ground*, he analyses, in Browning's manner, Carey's frame of mind before giving the fatal signal to the assassins of Burke and lord Frederick Cavendish ; and, in his Dublin eclogue *In Carey's Footsteps*, and in *The Curse of the Joyces*, he unsparingly exposes the cruelties of the Boycotting system. In 1864 appeared *Lays of the Western Gael*, containing a series of Irish ballads full of much finer work than he had yet achieved. Of these, *The Tain Quest* is, perhaps, the noblest effort ; but the magnificently savage lay *The Welshmen of Tirawley* is the most striking. In 1872 followed *Congal*, a splendid story of the last heroic stand by Celtic paganism against the Irish champions of the Cross, in which the terrible shapes of Celtic superstition, 'the Giant Walker' and 'the Washer of the Ford,' loom monstrously before us, and in which the contending hosts at Moyra are marshalled with fine realism. But Ferguson's genius was to break into even finer flower at the last, and, in *Deirdre* and *Conary*, published in his final volume of 1880, he reaches his fullest height as a poet.

Ferguson's tendency to act, at times, as a commentator on his own work and to present it at other times in a too ponderously Latinised form, as well as the careless, not to say bluff, disregard for verbal delicacies into which, now and then, he lapses, are the only habits to which exception can be taken in his technique. For his method is uniformly manly, and his occasional periods of inspiration sweep minor critical objections before them, as the blast from his Mananan's mantle swept the chieftain and his hound into the valley, like leaves before the wind.

Gerald Griffin, who has caught much of the quality of Oliver Goldsmith's style, though his work is more consciously Irish, stands midway between Anglo-Irish and Irish-Irish writers. He was the author of *The Collegians*, perhaps the best of Irish novels written in the nineteenth century. He also wrote a successful play, *Gisippus*, and some charming ballads. He had a quiet sense of humour, and carried this into his novels and Irish stories, and his musical ear and deft use of unusual metres give him an enduring place among our lyrical writers. He has a leaning towards Gaelic words, and introduces them freely into the refrains to his songs ;

but he neither attempts the Hiberno-English vernacular cultivated by Lover, nor the form of Gaelic-English adopted by Walsh and Ferguson, and, while his *milieu* is essentially, though not obtrusively, Irish, his phraseology is distinctly English, or, at any rate, Anglo-Irish.

William Alexander, archbishop of Armagh and sometime professor of poetry at Oxford, deals very beautifully with Irish scenery in many of his poems, and writes with delicate spirituality; but his wife, Cecil Frances Alexander, born Humphreys, had a more Irish heart with a wider range of sympathy, and the pulse beats as quickly to her *Siege of Derry* as it does to 'Charlotte Elizabeth's' *The Maiden City*. Her hymns and sacred poems, including *The Burial of Moses*, much admired by Tennyson, are household words, and her less wellknown lyric *The Irish Mother's Lament*, is one of the most poignant appeals of the kind ever uttered.

The recent death of T. D. Sullivan, long editor of *The Nation* in its latest phase of political existence, removed from the field of Irish patriotic literature its most distinguished veteran. For, although he wrote stirring narrative poems entitled *The Madness of King Conchobar* and *The Siege of Dunboy*, the stronghold of the O'Sullivans of Beara, and shared with Robert Dwyer Joyce the honour of giving to fine English verse the beautiful early Irish *Story of Blanaid*, it was as a writer of patriotic Irish songs and ballads that he made his special poetical mark. His *God Save Ireland*, if but as a makeshift, has become the Irish national anthem. His much finer *Song from the Backwoods* is widely and affectionately known, as is, also, his impetuous rebel ballad *Michael Dwyer*, and his simple but most pathetic *A Soldier's Wake* will not be forgotten.

The Fenian movement, unlike that of the Young Irelanders, was unassociated with literary effort. Yet it had an organ, *The Irish People*, whose staff included men of ability: T. Clarke Luby, John O'Leary and C. J. Kickham. O'Leary lived to write, in his old age, the history of Fenianism in a rambling and disappointing manner. His sister Ellen had, however, a distinct literary gift. During her brother's long period of imprisonment and banishment she lived quietly in Tipperary, waiting the hour of his return and then made a home for him in Dublin, which became a centre of Irish literary influence. Robert Dwyer Joyce, the brother of the historian and archaeologist Patrick Weston Joyce, was another Fenian. After producing some stirring ballads such as *The Blacksmith of Limerick*, he slipped away to the United States

and made his mark in Boston, both as a medical man and as the author of *Deirdre* and *Blanaid*, spirited narratives in Irish verse. John Boyle O'Reilly, after reprieve from execution for having joined the Fenians though a soldier in the service of the queen, escaped from imprisonment in Australia on board an American vessel, and, after a while, became editor of *The Boston Pilot*, as M<sup>c</sup>Gee had been before him. He wrote much spirited verse, including *The Amber Whale* in his *Songs from the Southern Seas*, and became a leading literary figure in Boston. But, undoubtedly, Kickham was the Fenian writer who has left the best literary work behind him. His ballads are touched with simple pathos and deserve their wide popularity. Of these, *The Irish Peasant Girl* is, perhaps, the bestknown. His novel, *Knocknagow*, has been well compared in its characteristics to the work of Erckmann-Chatrion for attention to minute details and homely incident, and is brimfull of shrewd observation and bright humour; indeed, it deserves to rank among the best novels descriptive of Irish life.

Sir Jonah Barrington is more properly a historian than a writer of fiction; but his *Personal Sketches* of his own times have a literary quality which makes them worth recording.

Marguerite Power, countess of Blessington, after an unhappy first union, married the earl of Blessington and lived with him on the continent. Her two volumes *The Idler in Italy* and *The Idler in France* show the fruit of her foreign experiences. She lost her husband in 1829, and, subsequently, settled at Gore house, which, for fourteen years, was the resort of many famous men and women of letters of the day, and, in 1832, her *Journal of Conversations with Lord Byron* was produced and became at once popular. As a novelist and anecdotist, she favourably impressed one side of the critical world of her day.

Sydney Owenson began life as a governess, and, at the age of twenty-one, published a novel *St Clair or the Heiress of Desmond*, which proved successful enough to enable her to devote herself to literature. She married Sir Thomas Charles Morgan, after the publication of *The Wild Irish Girl*, and, with him, travelled abroad. Like lady Blessington, she wrote her experiences of life in France and Italy. In the French volume, she had her husband's assistance, as, also, in her *Book without a Name*. Her two volumes of continental experiences, *France* and *Italy*, were bitterly attacked by Croker in *The Quarterly*; but she had as her champions Byron, who, in a letter to Moore, speaks of her *Italy* as 'fearless and



excellent on the subject of Italy,' and her friend sergeant Talfourd, who assisted her to reply to Croker with wit and good temper. Undoubtedly, she often wrote carelessly, often gushed in the manner of her time and betrayed conceit in her writings, but, of her bright ability as a novelist and storyteller, there can be no doubt, and she has left one vivid Irish lyric behind her, *Kate Kearney*, which is still frequently sung to the air to which she wrote it.

Mary Shackleton, afterwards Mrs Leadbeater, whose quaker father Richard Shackleton was Burke's schoolmaster, published, in 1794, her first work, *Extracts and Original Anecdotes for the Improvement of Youth*, intended to brighten the literature to which her young friends were then restricted. She followed this with a book of poems of quiet charm, and *Cottage Dialogues of the Irish Peasantry*, intended as an appeal on behalf of that suffering class, and concluded her productivity with *The Annals of Ballitore from 1768—1824*, a life-like record of the doings and sayings, droll and pathetic, of the folk of a quaker village during periods of peace and amid the scenes of the rebellion of 1798, which she had herself witnessed. This work, with a memoir of the authoress by her niece, Elizabeth Shackleton, appeared in 1862 under the title *The Leadbeater Papers*.

An Irish woman writer of exceptional gifts was Anna Murphy<sup>1</sup>, the daughter of D. Brownell Murphy, an eminent Dublin miniature painter, whose high intelligence had a marked influence upon her subsequent career. She acted as governess in the family of the marquis of Winchester, and, subsequently, in that of lord Hatherton, with whom she travelled in Italy. It was during this period that *The Diary of an Ennuyée* was written; but it was not published till after her marriage with Robert Jameson, a barrister who became successively a puisne judge in the West Indies and in Canada. This charming book became deservedly popular, as did her fresh and fanciful *Winter Stories and Summer Rambles in Canada*, into which country she had passed with her husband. She also wrote many other works of different kinds, those on art exhibiting much antiquarian knowledge and delicate taste.

Somewhat wanting in constructive skill, but with a gift of good-humoured cynicism, Marmion W. Savage belongs to the novelists of the school of Charles Kingsley. Passing from an official position in Dublin to journalistic duties in London, and

<sup>1</sup> See, *ante*, chap. III.

becoming editor of *The Examiner*, he found leisure to write a series of novels, two of which, *The Bachelor of The Albany* and *Reuben Medlicott*, became popular in this country and in the United States, where they were reprinted. But his *Falcon Family*, a satire on the leaders of the Young Ireland party, is the best known and ablest of his stories, and if, as now conceded, some of his sarcastic sketches of these men were overdrawn, they are, at any rate, extremely amusing.

Julia Kavanagh was the daughter of Morgan Kavanagh, author of writings on the source and science of language. Long residence in France during girlhood enabled her to describe French life and character with a fine faithfulness which have secured her tales and novels much acceptance. Later, she visited Italy, the result being *A Summer and Winter in the Two Sicilies*. Then followed her successful *French Women of Letters*. Of her French tales, it has been well said that they are exquisitely true to life, delicate in colour, simple and refined in style and pure in tone, and, among them, *Natalie* may be regarded as one of the best French stories written by a British hand.

Annie Keary, daughter of an Irish clergyman holding a living in Bath, where she was born, wrote a series of stories and novels of which her *Castle Daly*, published in *Macmillan's Magazine*, and *A Doubting Heart*, which did not appear till after her death, are the most remarkable. But she was also authoress of *A York and Lancaster Rose*, and, in collaboration with her sister, of a Scandinavian story, *The Heroes of Asgard*. She was a singularly unaffected writer, who knew her Irish atmosphere well, and who, therefore, could give full effect to its sudden changes from brightness to gloom, from storm to calm.

Emily Lawless, daughter of lord Cloncurry, was attracted into the open-air life of Ireland by her taste for natural history and, later, she was drawn by her sympathy with the country folk of the west to study Irish history in its relation to them, with a result shown most profoundly in her poems and works of prose fiction. Ireland had been graven on her very soul. For, though there is plenty of alternating Irish shower and sunshine in *Hurriah* and *Grania*, and notes of exultation occasionally leap forth from her *With the Wild Geese*, yet, no one can read through her first two novels or, indeed, many pages of *With Essex in Ireland*, without that painful perplexity which must haunt all who attempt candidly to face the eternal riddle presented by that distressful country to all students of its history.

Finally, of recent women novelists, mention must be made of Charlotte O'Connor Eccles, for her *Rejuvenation of Miss Semaphore* and *A Matrimonial Lottery*, which achieved popularity by their droll situations and exuberant fun; but her *Aliens of the West* contained work of much finer quality. She takes us behind the shutters of Irish country shop life in a most convincing manner, and the characters drawn from her Toomevara are true to type. The disillusionment of Molly Devine, 'The Voteen,' with her commonplace, not to say vulgar, home surroundings, on her return from the convent school, with its superior refinements; her refusal to marry so-called eligible, but, to her, repulsive, suitors, encouraged by her mother and stepfather, and her final resolve to become a nun, in order to escape farther persecution of the kind, is told with convincing poignancy, while a variant of this theme is treated with even more power and pathos in *Tom Connolly's Daughter*.

John D'Alton was a principal contributor to Hardiman's *Irish Minstrelsy*, and, in 1814, published *Dermid or Erin in the days of Boroimha*, a metrical romance in twelve cantos, written in smooth verse and showing a real knowledge of the times described, for he was an antiquary of note. In addition, he wrote a series of historical works of value, including *The Annals of Boyle* and *The History of County Dublin*.

John Mitchel is a very significant figure in Anglo-Irish literature. The son of a nonconformist minister who had been a United Irishman in 1798, Mitchel had the rebel in his blood. He was a student of Trinity college, Dublin, and, afterwards, more or less of a constitutionalist as writer and contributor to *The Nation* (of which, at a later date, he became editor); and he was especially subdued in tone in his preface to the *Life of Hugh O'Neill*, earl of Tyrone, a work included in Gavan Duffy's first *Irish Library*. But he drew apart from the moderate section of repealers headed by Daniel O'Connell, and started *The United Irishman* with the avowed object of fanning into rebellion what he described as 'the holy hatred of English Rule.' His utterances in this organ finally became so dangerously violent that it was suppressed, and he was prosecuted and found guilty of treason felony. He was sentenced to undergo fourteen years transportation, but, five years afterwards, escaped from Tasmania, and, after many adventures, graphically described in his *Jail Journal*, reached California, and, later, settled in New York.

During the American civil war, in which he espoused the cause of the south, and gave the lives of his two sons to that cause, he conducted *The Richmond Examiner*. In 1867, he started *The Irish Citizen* in New York and, in 1875, he was elected member for Tipperary. Mitchel was a writer who showed undoubted genius when the fit was on him; but much of his work, in his *History of Ireland*, is slovenly and not a little even of the *Jail Journal* is rhetorical and long drawn out.

William McCullagh Torrens, eldest son of James McCullagh, assumed his maternal name for family reasons. A successful practitioner at the Irish, then at the English, bar, he entered parliament for Finsbury, and successfully promoted measures for the amelioration of the lower classes. He wrote biographies of Sheil, Sir James Graham and lord Melbourne, and several important works on political science. He had a distinct literary gift, of which his interesting and brightly written *Life of Melbourne* is a typical example.

John Francis Waller, a Trinity college, Dublin, man, and long a contributor to, and afterwards editor of, *The Dublin University Magazine*, was best known in his day by his poems, appearing under the nom-de-plume Jonathan Freke Slingsby. Not a few of these lyrics, such as *The Song of the Glass*, *The Spinning Wheel Song*, *Kitty Neil*, have become popular by their grace and sparkle, and, occasionally, he succeeds in more serious verse. Waller also wrote many of the articles in *The Imperial Dictionary of Universal Biography*, and, generally, superintended the production of this work.

John Francis O'Donnell drifted from the south of Ireland to London, where, for a while, he was editor of *The Tablet*, and his verse contributions were welcomed by Dickens to his magazines. Many of his poems were also published in *Chambers's Journal*. He wrote in *The Lamp* a novel entitled *Agents and Evictions*. He will, however, be best remembered by his lyrics and, more especially, by *A Spinning Song*, which has found its way into most recent anthologies of Irish verse.

Francis Davis, 'the Belfast man,' as he is called, was the son of a soldier of Ballincollig, county Cork; but, to his mother, a woman of good Scottish Highland family and fine intellectual and moral gifts, he owed the influences which made him a man of mark at the times of catholic emancipation, and later. He lost her, however, when but a boy, and his father then consigned him to the care of a rich but miserly relative, for whom he worked at the

loom, suffering much hard treatment at his hands. On his father's death, he escaped from this drudgery to Belfast, where

As the weaver plied his shuttle,  
Wove he, too, the mystic rhyme.

Here, he became the Ebenezer Elliott of the northern popular movement. About 1830, he travelled through England and Scotland, earning his living by his trade, and writing poems all the while, and, at the same time, studying French, Latin, Greek and Gaelic. Later, he left the loom for the editorial chair of *The Belfastman's Journal*, and then became a contributor to many periodicals. There is a distinctly Scottish strain in Davis's poems, probably due to his mother's blood and early influences upon him. His political verse is pointed and spirited, but inferior to his countryside songs, which are simple and picturesque and full of unaffected feeling, though they often need the pruning hook.

Bartholomew Simmons, who held an appointment in the London excise office till his death in 1850, was a popular contributor to leading English magazines. Of his *Napoleon's last look*, *Maga's* critic thus wrote:

Simmons, on the theme of Napoleon, excels all our great poets. Byron's lines on that subject are bad; Scott's poor, Wordsworth's weak; Lockhart and Simmons may be bracketted as equal; theirs are good, rich and strong.

This tribute cannot be said to be undeserved, though Simmons's verses just miss perfection by their somewhat unrestrained rhetoric, and his fine ballad, *The Flight to Cyprus*, has too much of Irish exultation about it.

Miss Casey (E. Owens Blackburne) became blind at eleven years of age, and remained so for many years. After a hard struggle to secure a literary position in London, she succeeded as a novelist and writer of short stories. A collection of the latter under the title *A bunch of Shamrocks* was published in 1879, and shows her knowledge of Irish peasant life and speech.

Richard Dowling passed from a business into a literary career. He was on the staff of *The Nation*, became editor of *Zozimus*, the *Dublin Punch*, and, afterwards, was the mainstay of *Ireland's Eye*, another Irish humorous periodical, and, yet again, started *Yorick*, a London comic paper. But he did not find himself, from the literary point of view, till he wrote and published *The Mystery of Killard*, the central idea of which is 'the abnormal nature of a deafmute, which leads him to hate his own child because that child can hear and speak.' The originality of this theme, and the

weird skill with which it was worked out, established his reputation as a novelist; but, perhaps, his best claim to literary reputation is his volume of essays, *On Babies and Ladders*, which is full of quaint fancies.

Lewis Wingfield, as actor, artist, surgeon, war-correspondent and novelist had a curiously varied career, as may well be believed. When the Franco-German war of 1870 broke out, he served as surgeon on the German side, and was present at the battles of Woerth and Wissembourg, but returned to Paris in time for the first siege, and was then employed both as one of the surgeons in the American hospital, and as correspondent of *The Daily Telegraph*. Meanwhile, he was not idle with his brush, and one of his pictures was bought by the French government. In 1876, he entered on his career of novel-writing. His first story was *Slippery Ground*; his second, *Lady Grizel*, dealing with the history of George III, attracted men's attention. His third effort, *My Lords of Strogue*, describing Irish affairs at the time of the union, was still more successful. Believing that books on prison life published by ex-convicts are full of misrepresentations and exaggerations, he obtained special facilities from the Home office for studying the inside of prisons, and, as a result, published a novel suggested by these experiences.

A group of friends, all of whom achieved success as writers on antiquarian subjects, were the earl of Dunraven, James Henthorn Todd, author of a *Life of St Patrick*, Sir John Gilbert, author of *The History of Dublin*, William Stokes and his daughter Margaret Stokes, authors respectively of *The Life of George Petrie* and *Early Christian Architecture in Ireland*, bishops Graves and Reeves, and, most noted and versatile of all, Patrick Weston Joyce. Sixty-two years ago he contributed Irish folk-songs, and notes on Irish dances to Petrie's *Ancient Music of Ireland*. In his spare hours, when an active teacher, professor and training college principal, he produced what have since become standard works on Irish school method and Irish names of places. Turning his attention to Irish history, he wrote several works on the subject; the most important of which is his *Social History of Ireland*, two volumes full of valuable learning, yet written with a direct simplicity that at once engages the attention of the reader. His *Old Celtic Romances*, a series of free translations from old Irish folk-tales, moreover, as has been said above, inspired Tennyson's *Voyage of Maeldune*.

Archbishop McHale, next to O'Connell, exercised a more

prolonged influence on the Roman catholic population of his country than any Irishman of his time. Appointed professor of dogmatic theology at Maynooth, he wrote a series of letters chiefly concerned with controversial questions and catholic emancipation, under the signature Hierophilus. His letters showed great vigour of style and this, coupled with the energy of his character and eloquence gained for him from O'Connell the title 'The Lion of the fold of Judah.' Appointed archbishop of Tuam, he continued his controversial letters and preached many sermons of note. He was also a renowned Irish scholar, and not only translated sixty of Moore's melodies into that language, but rendered into Gaelic six books of the *Iliad* and several portions of the Bible.

Matthew Russell, S.J., was the younger son of Arthur Russell of Killowen, and brother of Charles, lord Russell of Killowen and lord chief justice of England. A devoted Jesuit priest, father Russell yet found time to gather round him at the office of his *Irish Monthly*, which he conducted for more than a generation with the utmost zeal and judgment, all the ablest of the young Irish writers of his day. There, Oscar Wilde and Rosa Mulholland and that charming but too short-lived poetess Rose Kavanagh and, indeed, all the rising story-writers and poets and poetesses of the Ireland of his day enjoyed his wise friendship and literary advice. 'But the little periodical' as one of the women contributors to it, now become famous, writes 'has real distinction apart from the names, distinguished and to be distinguished that are ever amongst its contributors.' Much of this was due to the work of its editor, who was a writer of both graceful and moving verse and prose, touched with fine spirituality.

Descended, it is understood, from a court musician dubbed 'Synge' for his vocal talents by Henry VIII, John M. Synge spent his early manhood in Paris amid art and literary influences which attracted him to the elemental aspect of the Irish peasant mind when he returned to his native Wicklow. He did not find himself or rather he was not found by W. B. Yeats for the Irish Literary theatre till he was approaching forty years of age and he died almost as soon as he had become famous. By that time he had written six remarkable plays, including the brilliant and much criticised *Playboy of the Western World*, which, indeed, became a storm centre of political and literary antagonism between those who regarded it as an outrage on Irish character and those who defended it as a justifiable treatment of certain phases of Irish fundamental passions. Synge's medium of dramatic expression is

an artistic modification of the dialect used by those of the Irish peasantry who carry Gaelic turns of thought and expression into their current English speech.

This he uses with convincing skill not only in *The Playboy*, the beautiful tragedy entitled *The Riders to the Sea*, the broad, bitter, whimsical, wistful *Well of the Saints* and the brutally humorous *Tinker's Wedding*, but, above all, in his single verse drama, his lovely, fatalistic *Deirdre of the Sorrows*, written when he knew he was dying of an incurable disease. 'Before verse can be human again, it must learn to be brutal,' he wrote in the preface to his slim volume of poems and translations. He tries to prove this in such passages as the following from his lines *In Kerry* :

And this I asked beneath a lovely cloud  
Of strange delight with one lark singing loud:  
'What change you've wrought in graveyard, rock and sea,  
This wild new Paradise to wake for me.....'  
Yet knew no more than knew these merry sins  
Had built this stack of thigh-bones, jaws and shins!

These short poems, his own *disjecta membra*, are, indeed, much of the nature of the grotesque relics of humanity, described by him above. Not so his two volumes of descriptive prose *The Aran Islands* and *In Wicklow, West Kerry and Connemara*. Here, his sympathy with wild nature and curious interest in and brotherly feeling for wild human kind make us realise the artist and the man alike.

Finally, we agree with T. W. Rolleston that the plays of Synge stand apart from the pessimistic pictures of 'disillusionment, frustration and ignobility' characterising many of the plays of the new Irish drama.

In his characters, in spite of all the outward barbarism and cynicism, I at least feel conscious of a certain lift, an undulating force, like the swell from an invisible ocean of life, which marks these people out as the destined conquerors, not the victims of circumstances.

They may shock us, they have shocked a great many worthy people, but they can never discourage or depress.



## CHAPTER X

### ANGLO-INDIAN<sup>1</sup> LITERATURE

ON the analogy of the literature of the great British self-governing dominions, Anglo-Indian literature should, logically, be the territorial English literature of British India. But the degree to which the ever-changing English community that guards and administers India differs from the settled inhabitants of Canada or Australia is, at the same time, an explanation of the main peculiarities of that literature and, also, the measure of the difficulty which confronts any attempt to define it. Anglo-Indian literature, as regards the greater part of it, is the literature of a comparatively small body of Englishmen who, during the working part of their lives, become residents in a country so different in every respect from their own that they seldom take root in its soil. On the contrary, they strive to remain English in thought and aspiration. By occasional periods of residence in England, they keep themselves in intimate touch with English life and culture: throughout the period of their life in India they are subject to the influence of two civilisations, but they never lose their bias towards that of England, which, in most cases, ultimately re-absorbs them.

Anglo-Indian literature, therefore, is, for the most part, merely English literature strongly marked by Indian local colour. It has been published, to a great extent, in England, owing partly to lack of facilities in India, and, partly, to the fact that the Anglo-Indian writer must, as a rule, make his appeal mainly to the public in England and only secondarily to the English community in India. The actual writing has often been done in England during furlough or after retirement, because that is precisely the time when the Anglo-Indian has leisure for literary work. The years of retirement are also specially fertile for another reason, since not until

<sup>1</sup> The sense in which this term (now largely used in a different sense) is employed in the present section is defined in the text.

he leaves India has the official complete freedom from those bonds of discipline which, in India, have always hampered the free expression of opinion. Thus, Anglo-Indian literature is based in origin, spirit and influences upon two separate countries at one and the same time.

That this condition of affairs has prevailed in the past does not necessarily imply that it must continue. The future of the English language in India is a question of great moment to English literature. As a collateral, though not by any means inevitable, result of the establishment of the British Indian empire, English has become the language of government and a common medium of literary expression throughout a vast sub-continent containing 300,000,000 inhabitants. At the time when the empire was founded on the ruins of the Mogul dominion, the Persian language performed that double task, and it might have continued to do so had Englishmen preferred to orientalise themselves rather than to anglicise those among whom they lived. But, in addition to the natural disinclination of the Englishman to steep himself in orientalism, the introduction of English law and English learning carried with it, as an almost necessary corollary, the adoption of English as the language of universities and of the highest courts of justice. Hence, it followed that English became a medium of literary expression for the educated Indian. His writings in our language, together with those of the domiciled community of European or mixed origin, constitute a strictly territorial English literature, and may be regarded as that part of Anglo-Indian literature which is most potential of development in the future; but, in the past, they have, naturally, attracted little notice in comparison with the writings of the English immigrant population.

Father Thomas Stephens, who went to Goa in 1579, was the first Englishman to settle in India, and Anglo-Indian literature began with his letters, of no extrinsic value, to his father, which have been preserved by Purchas. Master Ralph Fitch, merchant of London, travelled in India and the east from 1583 to 1591, and his lively description of his adventures, preserved by Hakluyt and Purchas, was of the utmost value to those who sought to promote an English East India company.

For a hundred years after the East India company received its charter, Anglo-Indian literature consisted solely of books of travel. Of the large number of writings of this class, a few may find mention here. Sir Thomas Roe, the gallant Stewart diplomat

who was the ambassador of James I at the court of 'the Great Mogoar, King of the Orientall Indyes, of Condahy, of Chismer, and of Corason,' wrote a very readable journal narrating his life at the court of Jahangir. Edward Terry, his chaplain, wrote a *Relation of a Voyage to the Easterne India*, full of interesting observation, and including an account of his meeting with the 'Odcombian legstretcher,' Thomas Coryate<sup>1</sup>, whom Roe also mentions. William Bruton's *Newes from the East Indies* relates how the English obtained their first footing in Orissa in 1632, and is a fine piece of vigorous narrative English. William Methold, who was in India at the same time, tells in his *Relations of the Kingdome of Golconda*, preserved by Purchas, of his experiences in south India; while John Fryer, who belongs to the latter half of the seventeenth century, and had an interview with Aurangzib, throws a good deal of light on the contemporary politics of western India in his *New Account of East India and Persia*. These English writers of travel tales are far less famous than their brilliant French contemporaries of the seventeenth century, Bernier and Tavernier; but their *naïveté*, in the face of the many novel things they saw, combined with the delightful seventeenth-century narrative style in which they wrote, gives their writings a distinction which Anglo-Indian literature of this kind has never recaptured.

The greater part of the eighteenth century, until near the close of the governorship of Warren Hastings, was, in a literary sense, all but uneventful. It was a period of anarchy and war in India. The beginning of the century saw the English mere traders struggling for a foothold in India; its closing decades saw them sovereigns of vast territories. Alexander Hamilton, who was in the east from 1688 to 1723, wrote *A New Account of the East Indies*, but his book, though comprehensive, is rather rambling and commonplace. Between his date and 1780 there are only a few names which call for comment. Pre-eminent among them was that of Robert Orme. Born in India in 1728, he returned to the land of his birth as a 'writer' in 1743, and there, during the course of a successful official career, in which he was closely connected with many of the events afterwards discussed in his books, he gathered the knowledge which enabled him to become one of the greatest of Anglo-Indian historians<sup>2</sup>. His *History of the Military Transactions of the British Nation in Indostan* is the prose epic of the early military achievements of our race in India. An indefatigable, rather than a brilliant, writer, Orme remains

<sup>1</sup> See, *ante*, vol. iv, pp. 89 ff.

<sup>2</sup> See, *ante*, vol. x, pp. 293-4.

a mine in which all subsequent historians must quarry. In his *Historical Fragments of the Mogul Empire, of the Morattoes and of the English concerns in Indostan from the year 1659*, the conscientious and unwearied narrator of contemporary events became the industrious investigator of past history, though it is by his first book that Orme's name chiefly lives. Alexander Dow, who died at Bhagalpur in 1779, not only translated histories from the Persian, but wrote two tragedies, *Zingis* and *Sethona*, which were produced at Drury lane. His authorship of these plays, which were oriental in setting, was challenged by Baker in his *Biographia Dramatica*, 'for he is said by those who know him well to be utterly unqualified for the production of learning or of fancy, either in prose or verse.' Others who may be mentioned are John Zephaniah Holwell, a survivor of the Black Hole, who wrote on historical and other subjects after his retirement in 1760, including a *Narrative of the deplorable deaths of the English gentlemen who were suffocated in the Black Hole*, which was included in his *India Tracts*. Charles Hamilton, who wrote a history of those Rohilla Afghans whose expulsion from Rohilcand brought much odium upon Warren Hastings; James Rennell, the father of Indian geography, who wrote after his retirement in 1777; and William Bolts and Harry Verelst, whose quarrels in India resulted in the production of polemical history by them both.

The closing years of Warren Hastings's Indian career saw the real birth of English literature and literary studies in India. *Hicky's Bengal Gazette*, the first newspaper of modern India, was founded at Calcutta by James Augustus Hicky in 1780. It was a scurrilous production, but a sign of life. James Forbes left India in 1784, carrying with him the collected materials which he afterwards published as his *Oriental Memoirs*. The appointment, in 1783, of Sir William Jones as judge of the supreme court was an event of high importance in the history of the relations between east and west, as was also his foundation of the Asiatic society of Bengal. He is remembered primarily as the earliest English Sanskrit scholar; but, in the domain of Anglo-Indian letters, he takes rank not only by his translation of Kalidasa's *Sakuntala*, but, also, as the first Anglo-Indian poet. He had written verse before he came to India; while in India, he addressed the gods of Indian mythology in a series of hymns which, if not of the highest order of poetry, are yet aflame with enthusiasm and knowledge. Inferior to Jones as an orientalist, but superior as a poet, was John Leyden, that 'lamp too early quenched,' as Sir Walter Scott put it. He lived in the

east from 1803 to 1811, and, though he, too, is remembered chiefly as an orientalist, he is to be noted as the first of that long line of writers who expressed in verse the common feelings of Englishmen in 'the land of regrets.' His poetry is a simple expression of the emotions which all Anglo-Indians experience at some time—pride in the military achievements of our race, loathing at the darker aspects of Indian superstition and the exile's longing for home. His *Ode to an Indian Gold Coin* deserves a place in every Anglo-Indian anthology of verse as an expression of this last emotion.

The closing years of the eighteenth century, and the first two decades of the nineteenth, were marked by other signs of literary advance. Hugh Boyd, who, by some, was alleged to be Junius, was in India from 1781 to 1794, and made some attempt, in essays on literary and moral subjects in local journals which he conducted, to keep alive the flame of English literary culture in his adopted country. In 1789, the quaint translation into English of Ghulam Hussein Khan's *Siyar-ul-Muta'akhhirin* by the Franco-Turk Raymond, alias Haji Mustapha, was published in Calcutta. The intrinsic interest of this contemporary history of India, combined with the oriental phraseology and the Gallicisms with which the translation abounds, renders Raymond's book one of the most curious pieces of literature among Anglo-Indian writings. Meanwhile, Henry Thomas Colebrooke made a name for himself as the leading Sanskrit scholar of the day; James Tod was carrying on those researches in Rajputana which he ultimately gave to the world in the classic *Annals and Antiquities of Rajasthan*, a work fuller of romance than most epics; Mark Wilks, in the south of India, was both helping to make history and amassing the materials for writing it, which he eventually published as his impartially and critically written *Historical Sketches of the South of India*. Sir John Malcolm, who, also, took part in many of the events which he described, followed with his *Political History of India* in 1811, and, subsequently, with his *History of Persia*, his *Central India* and other works, including a volume of poems; while Francis Buchanan-Hamilton wrote on scientific and historical subjects, including *An Account of the Kingdom of Nipal*. As belonging to this period, too, may be mentioned Eliza Fay's *Original Letters from Calcutta*, descriptive of her travels from England to Calcutta, and the anonymous *Hartly House*, described as a novel, though, in form, a series of letters written by a lady and descriptive of life in Calcutta towards the close of the eighteenth century. Finally, Mary Martha Sherwood, the children's writer, was in India during this period and

her *Little Henry and his Bearer* was the gift which she gave to Anglo-Indian children in memory of the child she had lost.

The thirty or forty years which preceded the mutiny were full of events of the greatest moment for the future of the English language in India. Macaulay was in India from 1834 to 1838, and his minute on education resulted in the definite adoption by lord Bentinck's government of the English language as the basis of all higher education in India. Ram Mohan Roy, the Bengali reformer, had advocated in English writing this and other reforms, the style of which Jeremy Bentham compared favourably with that of James Mill. David Hare, a Calcutta watchmaker, gave him strong support, and eventually in 1816 the Hindu college was founded at Calcutta for the instruction of Indians in English; and the decision of the government of India, in 1835, that its educational subsidies should promote mainly the study of European literature and science, found its natural sequel in the foundation, in 1857, during the very crisis of the mutiny, of universities in which English was to be the medium of instruction at Calcutta, Madras and Bombay. The government of India had set out to give its subjects, so far as might be, an English mind.

As a result of this policy, there is, in modern British India, a steady and increasing output of English literature written by Indians. But, as is only natural, so drastic an innovation as the complete changing of a people's literary language could not bear immediate results of value, and not only has the bulk of Anglo-Indian literature continued to be written by Englishmen, but, for a very long time, it remained doubtful whether Indians could so completely become Englishmen in mind and thought as to add, except in the rarest and most exceptional cases, anything of lasting value to the roll of English literature.

While this remarkable change was beginning in India, Anglo-Indian writers were not idle. Heber, bishop of Calcutta, claims attention here rather by his *Narrative of a Journey from Calcutta to Bombay* than by his few Anglo-Indian poems; Henry Louis Vivian Derozio, most famous of those of our Indian fellow-men who are neither exclusively European nor Indian but share the blood of both, put all the pathos and passion of his own sensitive nature into his metrical tale *The Fakeer of Jungheera*; Henry Meredith Parker is remembered not only as an actor and musician but as a poet, essayist and story-teller. Among his productions was an Indian mythological narrative poem called *The Draught of Immortality* and two clever volumes of miscellaneous prose and verse entitled

*Bole Ponjis* (The Punch bowl). Major David Lester Richardson, of the Bengal army, abandoned military life and devoted himself to education and literature. He takes rank among Anglo-Indian writers mainly as a literary critic, though he also wrote poetry and history. The titles of his books, such as *Literary Leaves*, *Literary Chit-Chat*, *Literary Recreations*, are an index of the general trend of his mind, and suggest that he was probably happier in his work at the Hindu college, to which, by Macaulay's influence, he was appointed in 1836 as professor of English literature, than he had been in his previous career. Henry Whitelock Torrens, who was secretary of the Asiatic society from 1840 to 1846, was a clever essayist as well as a journalist and scholar, and his scattered papers were deservedly collected and published at Calcutta in 1854. Sir Richard Francis Burton was in India during this period, but his fame cannot be said to be specially Anglo-Indian.

Of the historians during the period, James Grant Duff and Mountstuart Elphinstone are pre-eminent. Grant Duff's *History of the Mahrattas* (1826) and Elphinstone's *History of India* (1841) are two of the classics of Indian history. The romantic interest of the former book, the accurate though uninspiring conciseness of the second, and the pioneering ability shown by both in the untitled regions which they surveyed, gave these books a standing which they still hold, despite the advance of knowledge since they appeared. Other historians were Horace Hayman Wilson, the Sanskrit scholar, who continued and edited James Mill's *History of British India*; John Briggs, the translator of Ferishta's *Muhammedan Power in India*; Sir Henry Miers Elliot, the unwearied student of the history of Mussulman India, whose *History of India as told by its own Historians* was edited after his death by John Dowson; and Sir John Kaye, prominent in the history of Anglo-Indian letters as the founder, in 1844, of *The Calcutta Review*, to which he frequently contributed. He also, long after his departure from India, wrote Indian history voluminously, his *History of the Sepoy War in India* being his best known work.

During this period, fiction established itself as one of the most vigorous branches of Anglo-Indian literature. William Browne Hockley made use of his undoubted genius for story-telling in producing tales based on his intimate knowledge of Indian life. *Pandurang Hari, or Memoirs of a Hindoo*, a lifelike picture of Maratha character with excessive emphasis on its darker side, appeared in 1826. *Tales of the Zenana, or a Nawab's Leisure Hours* was Hockley's best book. It is a sort of Anglo-Indian

*Arabian Nights*, filled with wit and liveliness. Hockley undoubtedly possessed narrative genius. He was unrivalled in the sphere of Anglo-Indian fiction, until Philip Meadows Taylor, novelist and historian, began his literary career in 1839 with *The Confessions of a Thug*, a gruesome presentation of those facts which Sir William Henry Sleeman embodied in official reports. His next production was *Tippoo Sultan*, a tale of the Mysore war, in 1840. Taylor's reputation, however, rests mainly on stories which he wrote after he retired in 1860, especially the trilogy *Tara, a Maratta Tale, Ralph Darnell* and *Seeta*. The three tales were connected by a curious link: the year 1657 was that of the triumph of the Maratha chieftain Sivagi over the Bijapur army, which laid the foundation of his people's power in India; the year 1757 saw a greater power than that of the Marathas arise at Plassey; 1857 was the year of the mutiny. These three events, occurring at intervals of one hundred years, supplied the central themes of the three tales. Taylor contrasts with Hockley as one who idealised, rather than delineated, his types.

The tendency of Anglo-Indian fiction, however, to turn away from the portrayal of Indian life and focus itself chiefly upon the life of the English in India, was well illustrated by *Oakfield: or Fellowship in the East*, by William Delafield Arnold, brother of Matthew Arnold. It was a book with a purpose; throughout its pages there breathed stern moral protest against the dissipation of the Anglo-Indian community and its disregard, as he conceived it, of the interests of the children of the soil. England has given to India few minds of more refined and sensitive texture than that of W. D. Arnold.

After the mutiny, Anglo-Indians continued to produce work of permanent value in most branches of literature. George Bruce Malleon, James Talboys Wheeler, John Clark Marshman and Sir William Hunter devoted themselves to the discovery of new knowledge in Indian history as well as to the popularisation of that already existing. John Watson McCrindle threw light on the history of ancient India; Charles Robert Wilson on that of modern Bengal; Henry George Keene took medieval and modern India as his subject; while Sir William Muir wrote *The Life of Mahomet* and other books on Islamic history. Of less important writers of history and kindred literature, the names are too numerous to recite, though Henry Elmsley Busteed's carefully written and attractive *Echoes from Old Calcutta* deserves mention as having secured a standard position among Anglo-Indian writings. These



historians were marked in the main by assiduous ability rather than by genius. Malleon, possessed as he was of a vigorous narrative style, was eminently suited to write the history of the Indian mutiny, had he not been so strong a partisan, a fault which revealed itself also in his *History of the French in India*. Wheeler and Marshman, without being distinguished by their style, came nearer to impartiality through their close Indian sympathies. McCrindle, Wilson, Keene and Muir alike produced work of lasting historical value; but, as a historian and man of letters, Sir William Hunter stands out as the most brilliant Anglo-Indian of the last generation. His style was picturesque and striking, his impartiality rare, his grasp of world-history wide and penetrating, and his industry enormous. Alike in his more technical work, such as *The Imperial Gazetteer*, his historical work, such as *The Annals of Rural Bengal* and his *History of British India*, his biographies and his lighter literary work, such as *The Thackerays in India* and *The Old Missionary*, he gave evidence of broad culture and of a rare power of accurate and vigorous literary expression. Hunter's death at a time when he had completed but one hundred years of his *History of British India* was the severest blow ever sustained by Indian historical studies.

In fiction, John Lang, who wrote novels both before and after the mutiny, is the earliest name with which we meet in this period. In his work, we notice a difference of attitude from that of *Oakfield*, since Lang cynically satirised Anglo-Indian failings over which Arnold's deeper nature grieved. Alexander Allardyce painted a very attractive picture of indigenous Indian life in his *City of Sunshine*, a study of Indian psychology. Henry Curwen, editor of *The Times of India*, used thin plots as a peg on which to hang a vast amount of clever talk, speculation and satire. Sir George Chesney, who created a sensation in 1871 by his *Battle of Dorking*, lives in Anglo-Indian literature mainly by *The Dilemma*, a powerful mutiny romance. Jessie Ellen Cadell, who was an oriental scholar of some merit, wrote two novels, of which the first, *Ida Craven*, described frontier life.

Among the poets, William Waterfield, Mary Leslie, Henry George Keene and Charles Kelly may be mentioned, in passing, among a host of minor writers. Waterfield derived the theme of his ballads from Indian mythology; Mary Leslie from Indian history and Indian nature; Keene, historian, essayist and poet, one of the early supporters of *The Calcutta Review*, and for some years before his death in 1915 the doyen of Anglo-Indian literary men,

published tasteful verse on Indian and other topics throughout a long literary life of over fifty years. Kelly, like many other Anglo-Indian writers, was inspired by the mutiny. But, pre-eminent among the poets of the last generation were Sir Edwin Arnold and Sir Alfred Comyn Lyall. Arnold was employed in India in educational work from 1856 to 1861, and then returned to England. As a poet, journalist and man of letters, he belongs mainly to the history of English literature proper, and he wrote all his best work long after his departure from India; but his whole subsequent life, and almost the whole of his subsequent work, bore predominant impress of his Indian experience. As an unwearied and tasteful translator of Indian poetry into English verse, Arnold is unrivalled and possesses an assured place in English literature; while, as regards his most original work, *The Light of Asia*, India may justly claim to have inspired some of its noblest passages, though, perhaps, she is responsible for its exotic and sometimes cloying sweetness. Sir Alfred Lyall, whose *Asiatic Studies* and *Rise and Expansion of the British Dominion in India* proved him to be one of the foremost Anglo-Indian thinkers and writers, combined thought and form most happily in the reflections on Indian politics and religion which he put into the form of *Verses written in India*. Never since Leyden's *Ode to an Indian Gold Coin* had the exile's longing been expressed so well as in *The Land of Regrets*, while *Siva: or Mors Janua Vitae* is one of the finest products of Anglo-Indian literature.

Among the many writers of humorous verse—a species of literature always popular in India—Walter Yeldham, who wrote under the name Aliph Cheem, deserves mention. His *Lays of Ind* made him the Anglo-Indian Hood, and revealed to his delighted generation the humour latent in Anglo-Indian life. By its side, Thomas Francis Bignold's *Leviora: being the Rhymes of a Successful Competitor* deserves mention.

Among miscellaneous prose writings of the period two famous satires claim notice. *The Chronicles of Budgepore*, by Iltudus Prichard, attempted 'to show the quaint results which an indiscriminate and often injudicious engrafting of habits and ideas of western civilisation upon oriental stock is calculated to produce.' Prichard had equal command of the bitterest irony and the most whimsical humour, and was the most powerful satirist whom Anglo-India has known. *Twenty-one Days in India, being the Tour of Sir Ali Baba*, which appeared in *Vanity Fair* in 1878—9, was satire of a lighter kind. It was the work of George Robert

Aberigh-Mackay, and the frank, humorous and deliberately cynical way in which it laughed at the *personnel* of the government of India, from the viceroy down to the humblest menial and the infinite tenderness of its pathos, secured to it a celebrity which it still commands.

Philip Stewart Robinson and Edward Hamilton Aitken may be treated together. They both took the familiar Indian sights, the birds, the trees, 'the syce's children...the mynas, crows, green parrots, squirrels, and the beetles that get into the mustard and the soup,' and wrote about them in pleasant prose. Robinson's *In my Indian Garden* and Aitken's *Behind the Bungalow* have few rivals in this class of writing, the predominant feature of which is a gay and lighthearted attitude towards the ordinary things, even the ordinary annoyances, of Indian rural life.

Despite the spread of the knowledge of English among the educated classes of India, Indians wrote comparatively little that can be regarded as permanent additions to English literature. The adoption of English as the language of the universities had the altogether unexpected, though in every way desirable, result of revivifying the vernaculars. Stimulated by English literature and English knowledge, Bankim Chandra Chatterji, the first graduate of Calcutta university, created Bengali fiction. Under the influence of the works of Scott, he wrote successful historical novels, and followed these with novels of Indian social life. Bankim, undoubtedly, was the first creative genius who sprang from the Indian renaissance brought about in the nineteenth century by the introduction of English education. But he deliberately turned his face away from all attempts to gain a reputation as an English writer. His younger rival, Romesh Chunder Dutt, sought fame in Bengali as a novelist, and, in English, as a historian, economist, novelist and poet. His *Lays of Ancient India* and his novels show him to have had a complete mastery of the technique of our language, and considerable imaginative power; but his history and his economics were sometimes too polemical for impartiality, and Romesh will live in literary history mainly as one who helped to create modern Bengali.

Ram Mohan Roy, as a pioneer of English education in India, Keshab Chandra Sen, as a religious propagandist, Kashinath Trimback Telang the Maratha, as a judge, scholar and translator, Bahramji Malabari the Parsi, as a social reformer, and hundreds of other Indians used our language for their own purposes almost as

if it had been their mother tongue; but, of those who attempted imaginative literature in English, very few succeeded in writing anything of permanent interest. Michael Madhu Sadan Dutt lives by his Bengali poems rather than by his *Captive Ladie*, an attempt, so early as 1849, to tell in English verse the story of Prithwi Raj, king of Delhi. Malabari, besides ardently advocating social reforms through the medium of English writings, wrote *The Indian Muse in English garb*, with, however, indifferent success. Lal Behari Day's *Govinda Sámanta: or The History of a Bengal Ráiyat* and his *Folk Tales of Bengal* were pieces of work well worth doing and competently carried out, though exhibiting ability rather than genius. In Torulata Dutt, however, we meet a different order of intellect. The daughter of Govind Chandra Dutt, who himself wrote tasteful English verse, and related to Sasi Chandra of the same family, a voluminous writer of English, she was in close contact with English or continental culture throughout most of her short life. She wrote a novel in French, which was published posthumously in Paris. Her English poetry displayed real creative and imaginative power and almost faultless technical skill. In her English translations (*A Sheaf gleaned in French Fields*), and in her *Ancient Ballads and Legends of Hindustan*, she so nearly achieved a striking success as to make one regret that our language is essentially unsuited to the riot of imagery and ornament which form part of the natural texture of the oriental mind. Her early death in 1877 at the age of twenty-one was a loss both to her own and to our race, but her life and literary achievements were an earnest of the more remarkable results which were likely to ensue, and are ensuing, from the fusing of western and eastern culture. The educational policy of the government of India is destined, given continuity of development, to react upon English literature in a manner realised even now by but a few, and certainly undreamt of by those who entered upon it. But, until its full results are made manifest, Anglo-Indian literature will continue to be mainly what it has been, with few exceptions, in the past—literature written by Englishmen and Englishwomen who have devoted their lives to the service of India.

## CHAPTER XI

### ENGLISH-CANADIAN LITERATURE

By the scheme of this *History* the writer is constrained to confine his investigation to the ranks of the illustrious dead. Now, whereas a moderately favourable case may be made out for our current literature, our dead are neither numerous enough, nor sufficiently illustrious to stimulate more than local enthusiasm, and our few early writers of distinction inevitably suffer in a discussion that fails to link them with their living descendants. It is a reasonably safe surmise that the names of not more than three of our deceased writers are known even to professional students of literature in Europe, and two of these names belong to the present generation. Judge Haliburton (Sam Slick) enjoys at least a modest measure of cosmopolitan reputation, and the poetry of Drummond and of Lampman has received recognition not alone upon its own intrinsic merits, but as being characteristically and distinctively Canadian in its quality.

The mention of Drummond's name suggests a difficulty that must be disposed of on the threshold of the discussion. To what authors writing within or without her borders may Canada justly lay claim? Some arbitrary test must evidently be employed. Drummond was born in Ireland and partly educated there, yet we include him inevitably among our Canadian writers; Grant Allen was born in Canada, yet we exclude him from the list; and Goldwin Smith, who lived in Toronto for forty years, can only by an unjustifiable extension of the definition be included in an account of Canadian literature. The criterion in these doubtful cases must surely be an identification with the interests of the country so complete that a Canadian character is stamped upon the work, or, in default of that, a commanding influence exercised by the author upon the development of the country's literature. There is obviously nothing Canadian about Grant Allen in motive or intention. A residence of forty years

would constitute an ordinary individual a Canadian; but Goldwin Smith came among us with his habits of thought unyieldingly fixed, and lived and died in our midst a philosophical radical of sixty years ago. His interests in pure literature were never extensive, and his influence upon our literature may be said to have been negligible, or to have been confined to our newspapers, which, doubtless, received some benefit from the purity and pungency of his journalistic style.

It is not necessary to apologise for, but merely to explain, the paucity of our literary performance. Canada has many advantages; but it has the disadvantage, in the literary sense, of being a young country, born in the old age of the world. All that tradition counts for in the literature of a European country we must forgo. Our literary past is the literary past of England; we have not yet had time to strike root for ourselves. Older countries have a progressive tradition and a harmonious evolution little interrupted by artificial considerations; whereas, with us, literature is compelled to be almost completely artifice. England had her spontaneous ballad and epic beginnings, her naïve miracle plays that responded to an imperative need of the time, her share in the exhilaration of the renaissance, when even imitation was an exercise of the original creative faculty; and, upon these broad foundations, she built her great self-conscious modern literature, each new generation of writers urged on by impulses from the past, reinforcing its lessons here, violently reacting from its opinions there and always excited by contact with the vivifying ideas that the present hour engenders.

It may be said that this is too flattering a picture, that England periodically goes to sleep, and that lethargy, rather than excitement, characterises her normal condition. But the statement was not made in flattery, and, if it does not always correspond with the facts, it may serve, at least, to point a contrast with colonial conditions. The raw material of literature we have here in abundance; but this material does not seem to germinate. Our activities are physical, and our mental needs do not require to be supplied by our own exertions. When London began to build her theatres, plays had to be created to employ them. We build theatres freely; but why should we go to the exertion of supplying the text or even the actors, when the United States and England are within such lazy reach? And so with the novel, and so, also, with poetry, but with this saving consideration that poetry, being an affair of impulse, can live, if not flourish, without

a public. It might be supposed that fiction has every opportunity to develop in a country where the conditions of life must, necessarily, be novel and the types of character widely diversified by emigration. But the story of our fiction is as brief, almost, and inglorious as is the story of our national drama. Certain living writers are using this new material to good purpose; but it is still necessary to account for the dearth of native novels in a novel-reading country. In partial explanation, it may be urged that, even if frivolous in intention, a novel is still a serious undertaking, and is rarely entered upon by a sheer amateur. Now, by reason of the conditions of life in Canada, and in view of the fierce competition to which a Canadian novelist would be subjected, we have not yet developed a professional literary class, and our great novels still lie ahead of us. Hitherto, the little fiction that has been produced has been principally historic in character, the glamour of our early colonial period, with its picturesque contrast of races, naturally suggesting the type. Historic fiction is, momentarily, out of fashion the world over, and our racial peculiarities are, perhaps, not yet sufficiently consolidated to afford suggestive material to the novelist whose commanding interest is in human character. We have Anglo-Canadian types, Irish-Canadian types, Scottish-Canadian types who are transplanted and scarcely altered Englishmen, Irishmen, or Scotsmen. The genuine Canadian type probably exists somewhere—a fusion of all these with a discreet touch of the Yankee—but he is so shadowy in outline that no novelist has yet limned his features for us. Efforts in this direction by distinguished outsiders have not been convincing. Of our native-born writers, the desultory humourist Haliburton alone possessed the shrewd insight into character that might have given us our Canadian Tristram Shandy; but he contented himself with giving us a Yankee Sam Slick, whom certain distinguished New Englanders emphatically repudiate as spurious and disreputable. It is a matter of regret that Haliburton, with his unquestioned literary ability, never consented to the discipline of even the most rambling plot, for, what his humour precisely needed was the co-ordination and direction that systematic fiction would have afforded. Though he obviously does not range himself within any of the categories under which it is proposed to treat Canadian literature—being neither poet nor novelist, and only in a secondary degree an historian—yet the permanence of his reputation among our writers warrants and necessitates a special reference to his work.

Thomas Chandler Haliburton was born at Windsor, Nova Scotia, on 17 December 1796, and, on his father's side, was remotely connected with Sir Walter Scott. He was called to the bar in 1820 and, in 1841, he was appointed to the supreme court of the province. In 1856, he resigned his office and removed to England, where he died in 1865.

Haliburton's literary work began with histories of Nova Scotia, published in 1825 and 1829. His Sam Slick papers first appeared in 1835 and 1836, as contributions in a newspaper edited by Joseph Howe, called *The Nova Scotian*, and were published in book form in Halifax and London in 1837. A second and third series followed in 1838 and 1840, the three series being combined, later, in one volume. A list of Haliburton's works will be found in the bibliography.

Artemus Ward traces the humour of the United States to its source in Sam Slick, and there is much to support the derivation. The fun is rather frayed and old now, and the serious motives which inspired it are out of date; but, taken in small instalments, the books are still diverting, and, of course, historically important in a minor way. Sam Slick has had his successors, but none of his descendants is so prolific of anecdote, and so voluble at large, as he. His shrewd remarks and illustrations are always apposite to some trait in American character, or throw light on some phase in American politics—and, in both connections, the term American is used here to describe conditions on either side of the border. In Haliburton, the old tory died hard, or, rather, refused to die; and, that he might give loose rein to his political prejudices without the tedium which a heavy exposition entails, he invented that strange compound of shrewdness, wit, vulgarity and sheer dishonest cunning—Sam Slick the Yankee clockmaker. Wordsworth uttered solemn truths through the lips of a perambulating pedlar; it was an equally ingenious conception to make a wandering clockseller the purveyor of political wisdom. It is probable that the author invented him in order to contrast his smartness and characteristic Yankee enterprise with the inertia of his own 'blue-nose' compatriots of Nova Scotia. Since, however, it would have been too incongruous to present, through Sam's irreverent lips, the whole body of the old-fashioned tory doctrine dear to the author's heart, a prosy New England parson, the Rev. Mr Hopewell, is introduced in order to supply the deficiency. This trio, therefore, it is—Sam Slick with anecdotes innumerable gathered in his ubiquitous



wanderings, the parson with his prosy moralisings and the squire with his interjected protests and leading questions—who, between them, compose the serious treatise on political science which deservedly takes rank among the amusing books of the century.

Two purposes—one rather should say two passions—dominate these books. Haliburton had a deep affection for his native province and appreciated its possibilities of development, but he found its people lethargic and improvident, and he sought persistently to rouse them if not to a sense of shame at least to a sense of responsibility. Many of the practical reforms and developments suggested by him have been introduced, and it is possible that his insistence may have accelerated the inevitable march of events. The languor of his fellow-countrymen was a perpetual source of irritation :

‘The folks to Halifax,’ says Sam Slick, ‘take it all out in talkin—they talk of steam-boats, whalers, and railroads—but they all eend where they begin—in talk. I don’t think I’d be out in my latitude, if I was to say they beat the women-kind at that. One feller says, I talk of goin to England—another says I talk of goin to the country—while a third says, I talk of goin to sleep. If we happen to speak of such things, we say “I’m right off down East,” or “I’m away off South,” and away we go just like a streak of lightnin.... You’ve seen a flock of partridge of a frosty mornin in the fall, a crowdin out of the shade to a sunny spot, and huddlin up there in the warmth—well, the blue-noses [*i.e.* the Nova Scotians] have nothin else to do half the time but sun themselves. Whose fault is that? Why it is the fault of the legislatur; they don’t encourage internal improvement, nor the investment of capital in the country, and the result is apathy, inaction, and poverty.’

So strongly does the author feel the force of Sam’s remarks that he italicises the conclusion of the homily, and casts the Yankee idiom aside.

‘No,’ said he (with an air of more seriousness than I had yet observed), ‘how much it is to be regretted, that, laying aside personal attacks and petty jealousies, they would not unite as one man, and with one mind and one heart apply themselves sedulously to the internal improvement and development of this beautiful Province. Its value is utterly unknown, either to the general or local Government, and the only persons who duly appreciate it are the Yankees.’

Two points are to be noted, namely, that this extract is introduced to represent not the humour but the purpose of the volume, and that, when the author is imbued with the seriousness of an argument, no artistic scruples forbid him to allow Sam Slick to speak out of character.

Reference has been made to a second dominating purpose in these books. Haliburton was passionately devoted to the cause

of imperial unity at a time when Great Britain neglected her colonies, and when the loosely organised provinces that now are Canada were apparently drifting towards independence or annexation. The two agencies that saved a dangerous situation were responsible government and confederation. To the first, Haliburton was obstinately opposed; of the unifying possibilities of the second, he was, like many of his contemporaries, pardonably ignorant. The solution he offered was tory in the extreme: the rising tide of democracy must be stemmed by a severe restriction of the franchise; the executive councils must be consolidated in power; the French must abandon their language and their law; and the ambitions of intelligent colonists must be rewarded by the most ample distribution of patronage from the mother land. Canada was a stagnant pond that bred tadpoles and pollywoggles; a fresh stream of patronage would breed sizable fish. Responsible government was the partisan cry of Papineau and his rebel brood. Even the Yankee Slick is shocked at their pretensions:

For that old party, clique, and compact were British in their language, British in their feelings and British in their blood. Our party clique and compact is not so narrow and restricted, for it is French in its language, Yankee in its feelin', and Republican in its blood.

*The Clockmaker* was followed, in due order, by three further Sam Slick volumes—*The Attaché*, *Wise Saws* and *Nature and Human Nature*. They are full of rich humour, but suffer from a forcing of the vein. *The Attaché* represents Sam Slick 'at the Court of St James's,' where, obviously, he is out of his element. The book was intended as a burlesque rejoinder to Dickens's *American Notes*; but there is a kindliness in the satire which differentiates it from its prototype.

Taking all things into consideration, Haliburton's books merit the commendation they have received. They are choppy and unorganised, as the foregoing account of them will have made clear; but, in spite of the designed disorder of his style, he has produced work of permanent value. He is a *raconteur* of exuberant fertility, a passionate politician and an irredeemable and unforgivable punster.

Isabella Valancy Crawford is the first Canadian poet of distinction, and her work would challenge attention in the poetical history of any country. She was born in Dublin in 1850, and her family settled in Canada when she was a child of eight.

She spent her last years in Toronto, and her poems appeared, for the most part, in the unregarded corners of the daily papers. She died in 1886. Two years before her death, a meagre and unassuming volume of her verse was published, bearing the title *Old Spookses' Pass, Malcolm's Katie, and Other Poems*. In 1905, a reasonably full collection of her poems was published with an introductory notice by a fellow poet, Ethelwyn Wetherald.

Valancy Crawford's lyrical verse is singularly intense and pure, with the intensity and purity that we find in the work of Emily Brontë, whose shy austerity and solitary brooding passion her own suggests, without its tragic morbidity. *Love's Forget Me Not* which stands first in the volume, has this peculiar Brontë quality.

Suggestions of resemblance to famous writers may be excused in an account of an unknown poet. So, the following lyric may be compared, for its daintily jewelled workmanship, with many a similar lyric by Théophile Gautier, with whose very name Valancy Crawford was probably not familiar :

O Love builds on the azure sea,  
And Love builds on the golden sand,  
And Love builds on the rose-winged cloud,  
And sometimes Love builds on the land!

O if Love build on sparkling sea,  
And if Love build on golden strand,  
And if Love build on rosy cloud,  
To Love these are the solid land!

O Love will build his lily walls,  
And Love his pearly roof will rear  
On cloud, or land, or mist, or sea—  
Love's solid land is everywhere!

And a further resemblance which, again, is purely fortuitous, suggests itself between *The Helot* and Meredith's tersely powerful ballad *Attila*. There is the same compression, the same commanding vigour, and an approach, at least, to the imaginative breadth of Meredith's great poem.

Isabella Valancy Crawford was no man's disciple, but she read her poets to advantage. There is a quality in *Malcolm's Katie* (not a wholly successful piece) which argues a familiarity with Tennyson's narrative method, but the dependence is slight. Her dialect poems, of which *Old Spookses' Pass* is the most vigorous example, bring her into a comparison which is not wholly in her disfavour with Bret Harte, Lowell and their progeny of Hoosier and cowboy writers. How original her lyric gift is we realise by

her fresh handling of an old theme. There is a whole literature of the rose in English poetry. Valancy Crawford's version of the theme has the freshness of a new discovery :

The Rose was given to man for this:  
 He, sudden seeing it in later years,  
 Should swift remember Love's first lingering kiss  
 And Grief's last lingering tears;

Or, being blind, should feel its yearning soul  
 Knit all its piercing perfume round his own,  
 Till he should see on memory's ample scroll  
 All roses he had known;

Or, being hard, perchance his finger-tips  
 Careless might touch the satin of its cup,  
 And he should feel a dead babe's budding lips  
 To his lips lifted up;

Or, being deaf and smitten with its star,  
 Should, on a sudden, almost hear a lark  
 Rush singing up—the nightingale afar  
 Sing thro' the dew-bright dark;

Or, sorrow-lost in paths that round and round  
 Circle old graves, its keen and vital breath  
 Should call to him within the yew's bleak bound  
 Of Life, and not of Death.

If we cannot designate any single writer as the founder of a Canadian school of poetry, we can still point to Archibald Lampman as the poet who, under the necessary conditions of imitation, was as Canadian as circumstances would allow. With Wordsworth, Keats and Arnold on one's shelves, one does not draw inspiration from Sangster and Heavysege; but what sets Lampman in a different category from his predecessors is the fact that the poets of the younger Canadian generation have frankly admitted their debt to him. Lampman's work exhibits what a carefully trained poetic sense can achieve in an environment which he must himself have felt to be hostile to the free expansion of his talent, and his poetry is significant by what he sought to do no less than by what he accomplished.

His friend and fellow-poet, D. C. Scott, has told the story of his life in the brief memoir prefixed to his collected poems. Archibald Lampman was born in 1861 at Morpeth, Ontario, and was descended from a family of Pennsylvania Dutch loyalists, who migrated to Canada at the time of the revolution. After graduating at Trinity college, Toronto, he had a brief but severe experience as a schoolmaster, from which he made his escape into

the civil service. The rest of his life, until his death in 1899, was spent in the post office department at Ottawa.

Not much has been preserved from the work of his undergraduate days. His first volume *Among the Millet* was the product, chiefly, of the four years between 1884 and 1888. It was, in part, a period of imitation and experimentation. *The Monk*, a narrative poem, is diluted Keats, and the more ambitious *An Athenian Reverie* is a skilful, if somewhat dull, literary exercise into which he poured the results of his classical reading. Of neither piece need any young poet have been ashamed; but, obviously, there was no development possible in either of these directions. His supreme passion was nature, and he was quick to recognise that his best work was done in response to this dominant impulse. His nature sympathies are readily explained. Ottawa is beautifully situated between three rushing rivers whose valleys tempted his feet when the day's routine was done, and it is one of the advantages of the civil service that it does not monopolise all the hours of daylight. His masters in poetry, too, fostered this out-of-doors enthusiasm, for, though they owed much, indeed, to other influences than nature, still, in Wordsworth, Keats and Arnold, the descriptive vein was strong, and it was certainly the most communicable part of their work. There is evidence, in later years, that the general problems of society had begun to press in upon Lampman's mind; but these problems he was able to apprehend only through his imagination and his sympathies. Nature was everywhere about him in her ample beauty and variety; but the unaccented life of Ottawa afforded him no contact with the disastrous extremes that are generated in the intenser conditions of a large city.

Nature poetry is of many kinds and degrees. A rough summary of its varieties may serve the purpose of testing the range of Lampman's work in this direction. It should include the faithful reproduction of a scene under the necessary conditions of artistic selection and arrangement; the same, but with more particular reference to the emotional and intellectual reaction from the scene; an attempt to interpret the hidden significance of phenomena; and, finally, the use of nature as a pictorial background for human action, or as a setting for a mood.

The least interesting portion of Lampman's poetry lies in the second of the above heads. One thinks of the powerful philosophical reaction that *Tintern Abbey* gives us, or *The Prelude*, of the impetuous personal recoil of the *Ode to the*

*West Wind*, or of the rich emotional reflex of the *Ode to the Nightingale*; and, thinking of these superlative examples, one is compelled to recognise the insipidity and monotony of Lampman's reactions. Many of his poems that promise a fine result, such as *April, April in the Hills, The Meadow, Comfort of the Fields*, are carefully observed and exquisitely phrased, but are marred by a trite conclusion. Ardent lover as he is, he can enumerate the beauties of his mistress; but his tongue fails him to tell her more than that he loves her dearly, and that he is glad to escape into her presence from the dullness and vexations of his ordinary surroundings. *Morning on the Lièvre* is wholly free from this weakness, and reproduces with vigour and cunningly contrived detail a characteristic Canadian scene:

Far above us where a jay  
Screams his matins to the day,  
Capped with gold and amethyst,  
Like a vapour from the forge  
Of a giant somewhere hid,  
Out of hearing of the clang  
Of his hammer, skirts of mist  
Slowly up the woody gorge  
Lift and hang.

Softly as a cloud we go,  
Sky above and sky below,  
Down the river; and the dip  
Of the paddles scarcely breaks,  
With the little silvery drip  
Of the water as it shakes  
From the blades, the crystal deep  
Of the silence of the morn,  
Of the forest yet asleep;  
And the river reaches borne  
In a mirror, purple gray,  
Sheer away  
To the misty line of light,  
Where the forest and the stream  
In the shadow meet and plight,  
Like a dream.

From amid a stretch of reeds,  
Where the lazy river sucks  
All the water as it bleeds  
From a little curling creek,  
And the musk rats peer and sneak  
In around the sunken wrecks  
Of a tree that swept the skies  
Long ago,  
On a sudden seven ducks  
With a splashy rustle rise,  
Stretching out their seven necks,

One before, and two behind,  
 And the others all arow,  
 And as steady as the wind  
 With a swivelling whistle go,  
 Through the purple shadow led,  
 Till we only hear their whir  
 In behind a rocky spur,  
 Just ahead.

*The Frogs, Heat, Solitude, June, September, By an Autumn Stream* and *Snow* reveal Lampman's rare gift of observation, selection and phrasing; and they, too, have a significant value that transcends the mere terms of the description. By their representative qualities, these poems are symbolic, and Lampman attains this result not by the way of vagueness or mystical allusion, but by the sure strokes of his poetic detail. Two stanzas from *Heat* may serve to illustrate his skill in producing what we vaguely designate as atmosphere:

From plains that reel to southward, dim,  
 The road runs by me white and bare;  
 Up the steep hill it seems to swim  
 Beyond, and melt into the glare.  
 Upward half-way, or it may be  
 Nearer the summit, slowly steals  
 A hay-cart, moving dustily  
 With idly clacking wheels.  
 By his cart's side the wagoner  
 Is slouching slowly at his ease,  
 Half-hidden in the windless blur  
 Of white dust puffing to his knees.  
 This wagon on the height above,  
 From sky to sky on either hand,  
 Is the sole thing that seems to move  
 In all the heat-held land.

Nature is not commonly employed by Lampman as a background of human action. There is little in him of the spirit of romance if we make exception of his love for wild remote places. One poem *Between the Rapids*, from his first volume, is, however, quite romantic in its conception and illustrates, with much freshness, the *ubi sunt* theme that has tempted many poetic experimenters.

The title of his second volume, *Lyrics of Earth*, betokens his continued preoccupation with his favourite theme. He was preparing *Aleyone* for the press during his last illness, but did not live to see it published. It contains two poems, at least, that point in a new direction and show the current of his social sympathies. Of these one, *The Land of Pallas*, is ambitious but laboured;

the other poem, *The City of the End of Things*, is Lampman's highest imaginative achievement. It is a grim allegory of human life largely conceived and forcibly wrought. There is nothing else like it in his work.

The narrative pieces scattered through the volumes call for no particular mention. Lampman's constructive and dramatic sense was weak, and he had not the faculty of seizing upon some vivid incident and developing its possibilities. He gives us life at many removes from actuality. In the sonnet, he was notably more successful, and he felt himself that his best work was achieved in that form. His sonnets are thoroughly well organised, and he found them a convenient medium for conveying his philosophy of life upon the purely human side. They go far, therefore, towards saving his work from the monotony that otherwise would attach to it. They contain many shrewd remarks upon life and give us many fine records of imaginative moods.

So greatly have poetic methods altered since Lampman's death that already his poetry may seem to be old-fashioned. He has nothing either of the characteristic modern realism or mysticism, and his technique, by newer standards, seems cramped and unduly studied. He lacks subtlety and lyric fire, but he has merits that will survive many fluctuations of taste, and, without being distinctively Canadian, he is still our representative Canadian poet.

William Henry Drummond invented a mode of poetry that won him great popularity from the appearance of the first volume *The Habitant* in 1897. Dialect poems, exhibiting the humours of humble or rustic folk, have been written in many tongues. Drummond's originality consists in conveying his theme through the medium of a speech not native to the speakers. One has to imagine a sympathetic English-speaking listener and an expansive *habitant* farmer or *voyageur*, who, in a kind of fluid and most un-Browninglike monologue, reveals himself and his surroundings with mirth-provoking simplicity and charm. The full flavour of these pieces cannot be gained by mere reading, nor is the elocutionist's platform their proper setting. They should be heard, as most Canadians are privileged to hear them, repeated round a camp-fire by someone competent in French-Canadian English *patois*, or recited at cigar-time after dinner, when subtle literary qualities are prone to be neglected, and it suffices that a poem should be humorous and human. Thus it was that Drummond gained his first success and learned his power. His widow tells



the story in her biographical introduction to the posthumous volume, *The Great Fight*:

It was during my convalescence that *Le Vieux Temps* was written, and its first public reading was at a dinner of the Shakespeare Club of Montreal, of which the doctor had once been a member. On this occasion, being asked to reply to one of the toasts, he would have refused the invitation, declaring that speech-making was not in his line; but finally a compromise was effected by his diffident suggestion that perhaps he might read the new poem instead of making a speech. When the night of the dinner arrived he was with difficulty prevented from running off somewhere on the plea of professional duty. However, he went, and was bewildered by his own success. 'It's the strangest thing in the world,' he said, 'but do you know they simply went wild over that poem!' This was the beginning of a long series of triumphs of a like nature, triumphs which owed little to elocutionary art, much to the natural gift of a voice rare alike in strength, quality, and variety of tone, but most of all to the fact that the characters he delineated were not mere creations of a vivid imagination. They were portraits, tenderly drawn by the master hand of a true artist, and one who knew and loved the originals.

It is a healthy sign that poetry should, occasionally, revert to the primitive conditions from which it originated, and assume its original public function as a binding social force.

How Drummond's circumstances gave him access to his material may briefly be told. Born at Currawn, county Leitrim, Ireland, in 1854, he came to Canada with his parents at the age of eleven. Soon afterwards, his father died, leaving his widow with very narrow means. The boy studied telegraphy, and, in 1869, received an appointment in the little village of Bord-à-Plouffe on the beautiful Rivière des Prairies:

'Here it was,' to quote from Mrs Drummond's account, 'that he first came in contact with the *habitant* and *voyageur*, and listened to their quaint tales of backwoods life; here that he heard from Gédéon Plouffe the tragedy retold as *The Wreck of the Julie Plante*, a poem of which he himself thought little, and never cared to recite, but which had made its way through the length and breadth of the American continent before ever his first book of poems was published. It was the old lumberman's reiteration of the words, "An' de win' she blow, blow, blow!" which rang so persistently in his ears that, at the dead of night, unable to stand any longer the haunting refrain, he sprang from his bed and penned the poem, which was to be the herald of his future fame.'

By the year 1876, when he was twenty-two, Drummond had saved enough money to resume his interrupted education. From the high school in Montreal, he passed to McGill university, and, later, studied medicine at Bishop's college, Montreal, whence he graduated in 1884. After a few years of country practice, which familiarised him with the types represented in his *Canadian Country Doctor* and *Ole Doctor Fiset*, he returned, in 1888, to Montreal, continued his practice and, subsequently, lectured on medical jurisprudence at Bishop's college.

In 1905, Drummond became interested in some silver properties at Cobalt, which he and his brother successfully developed. The possibilities of wealth did not dismay him. What he craved was, in his own words, 'enough money to own a strip of salmon water, and the best Irish terrier going, and to be able to help a friend in need.' Smallpox broke out in his camp in 1907. He hurried there to cope with the disease, and, shortly after his arrival, died of a cerebral hemorrhage. Drummond's sympathy with the *habitant* and his passion for wild life had been dominant with him to the end. He perpetually refreshed himself in the springs from which his poetry flowed.

Four volumes of verse stand to Drummond's credit: *The Habitant*, *Johnnie Courteau*, *The Voyageur* and the posthumously published *The Great Fight*. Another small book, *Philorum's Canoe*, consists of two poems which reappear in *Johnnie Courteau*.

Drummond's work is not characterised by the polished perfection of individual lines or stanzas. It is impossible, therefore, to convey an adequate idea of his poetry by brief and disconnected quotation; let this be said in no disparagement of the result. It is honest, homely poetry, and Drummond broke new ground.

The humours and the forgivable, even, as Drummond tells them, the lovable, weaknesses of the *habitant* are traversed in these poems. He sings his clumsily efficient courting, his worthy pride in his abounding family of strapping sons and marriageable girls, his love of the old homestead by the river, his anxiety to return to it from his enforced wanderings and his reluctance to leave it when his increased fortunes give him the dazzling prospect of a 'tousand dollar' house. No poet ever derived his inspiration from simpler themes, and the reader shares his enjoyment of the good man's sublime self-content, his boastfulness, his love of a horse-race and a dollar bet, his parochial outlook on politics and the great world and his pardonable conviction that his own life, his own wife and family, his own village and village *curé*, his fields, his river and his weather are the best gifts that *le bon Dieu* dispenses. That in all this there is never a hint of unkindly caricature, the prefatory words of Louis Fréchette are sufficient proof:

Dans son étude des Canadiens-français, M. Drummond a trouvé le moyen d'éviter un écueil qui aurait semblé inévitable pour tout autre que pour lui. Il est resté vrai, sans tomber dans la vulgarité, et piquant sans verser dans le

grotesque... que le récit soit plaisant ou pathétique, jamais la note ne sonne faux, jamais la bizarrerie ne dégénère en puérilité burlesque.

The following poets deserve a note in any account of Canadian literature.

Joseph Howe was distinguished in the political life of his province of Nova Scotia. His poetry is rhetorical, and his literary qualities are best exhibited in his eloquent prose. Evan MacColl came to Canada in 1850. His best work is said to be in Gaelic. *Poems and Songs*, which appeared in 1883, has not much merit. Charles Heavysege showed, amidst much crudeness, occasional flashes of power. He came to Montreal from England in 1853. His reputation rests upon his sonnets and his dramatic poem *Saul*, which was described by a *North British* reviewer as 'one of the most remarkable poems ever written out of Great Britain.' Alexander McLachlan came from Scotland in 1840. He aspired to be the Burns of Canada. Charles Sangster, unlike the three last-named writers, was born in Canada. Before the advent of the younger generation, he was the representative poet of his native land; but his work is markedly inferior to that of his successors. What strength he possesses is exhibited to best advantage in his descriptive verse, and this is of not more than average merit. Thomas D'Arcy McGee was a man of brilliant talents, which overflowed by mere exuberance into literature. A member of the 'Young Ireland' group, he wrote in the feverish style that characterised those fervid patriots. McGee, after an adventurous youth, settled in Canada in 1857, and almost immediately became prominent in the political life of his adopted country. He was assassinated in Ottawa in April 1868. Sir James Edgar, whose chief activity, as in the case of Howe and McGee, was centred in politics, shared with them, also, a taste and talent for poetry. George Frederick Cameron died before he had reached the full measure of his powers. His early death, like that of T. B. Phillips Stewart and of Arthur Weir, must be considered a distinct loss to Canadian poetry. The more recent death of the Indian poetess, Pauline Johnson, is, also, to be reckoned among our losses, though she had lived long enough to show her capabilities. She had a genuine lyric gift within a limited range. The verses called *A Prodigal* have a note of true passion :

My heart forgot its God for love of you,  
And you forgot me, other loves to learn;  
Now through a wilderness of thorn and rue  
Back to my God I turn.

And just because my God forgets the past,  
And in forgetting does not ask to know  
Why I once left His arms for yours, at last  
Back to my God I go.

A very enjoyable part of Canadian literature connects itself with accounts of expeditions into distant regions of an unexplored continent. A number of the best records of adventurous journeys are written in French, of which many have been translated. The earliest of these explorers' volumes produced by an Englishman was by Sir Alexander Mackenzie, a high official in the North-West company, who made trips through to the Arctic and the Pacific, and, in 1801, published his *Voyages from Montreal through the Continent of North America*. It makes fascinating reading. George Heriot, the historian, wrote, in 1807, a curious pioneer volume *Travels through the Canadas* which is much more entertaining than his serious *History of Canada*. Alexander Henry was an American by birth who spent many years as a fur-trader in central Canada, and ended his days as a merchant in Montreal. His book *Travels and Adventures in Canada and the Indian Territories* was published in New York, in 1809, and was edited as recently as 1901 by James Bain of Toronto. Anna Brownell Jameson, who wrote on Shakespeare's women, spent a part of 1836—7 in and near Toronto, and, in the following year, published in three volumes *Winter Studies and Summer Rambles in Canada*. Of a similar type were two books written by Susanna Moodie, *Roughing it in the Bush; or Life in Canada* (1852), and *Life in the Clearing versus the Bush* (1853). These books describe the conditions of life in the early settlements more faithfully and, withal, more humorously than any other writer has described them.

History is more successfully organised in Canada at the present time than any other branch of literature. Our archives are being systematically explored, and societies exist for the purpose of editing old, and publishing new, material of a historical nature. Our earliest historians, Heriot, Smith and Christie were of the laboriously dull type that history frequently breeds. John Charles Dent, an Englishman by birth, was much more entertaining; but his partisanship impairs the value of his work. This consists of two readable histories, *The Last Forty Years* and *The Story of the Upper Canadian Rebellion*. The most complete and painstaking of our histories, dull without being scientific, but quite praiseworthy, is William Kingsford's *History of Canada*,

which covers the period from the discovery of Canada to the union of 1841. Ten volumes stand to Kingsford's credit, and he began to write history at the age of sixty-five. Haliburton's *Historical and Statistical Account of Nova Scotia* (1829) is still useful. Two other works by him—*The Bubbles of Canada* (1837) and *Rule and Misrule of the English in America* (1851)—have a historical tinge.

The war of 1812 has been variously recorded. David Thompson was imprisoned for debt as a result of his historic venture on this theme. Major John Richardson's *War of 1812*, in its re-edited form (1902), presents much valuable material. James Hannay produced a *History of Acadia* and a *War of 1812*. Lady Edgar, in her *Ten Years of Peace and War in Upper Canada*, presents a most interesting account of the time, based largely on the correspondence of the Ridout family to which she belonged. Her *Life of Brock* in the *Makers of Canada* series is clearly and entertainingly written. Lady Edgar also wrote a history of Maryland in the eighteenth century under the title *A Colonial Governor in Maryland*.

Sir John George Bourinot is the author of a popular history called *The Story of Canada*. He was a diligent and useful writer upon Canadian affairs, and his position as clerk of the Canadian house of commons gave him peculiar opportunities for the study of constitutional problems. The leading Canadian writer, however, on constitutional procedure was Alpheus Todd, whose works will be found in the bibliography. Two men, Joseph Howe and George Monro Grant, exercised by their voice and pen a powerful influence on the political thought of Canada. Their literary output was slender and does not give the full measure of their ability or influence.

There are some novels that have honestly died, and some that have never lived. Canada's fiction may, with few exceptions, be classed in one or other of these categories. The *Bibliography of Canadian Fiction* gives the titles of nearly one hundred and fifty novels written by authors deceased.

Mrs Brook has the distinction of producing, in 1769, the first novel, *Emily Montague*, which essayed a description of Canadian conditions at that interesting and remote time. Canadian fiction proper is supposed to date from the year 1832, when John Richardson published *Wacousta*. It is a curious book. To a certain point midway in the narrative, it holds the reader's

attention, and then breaks down into a series of wildly impossible situations without one redeeming human touch to save them from utter absurdity. *The Canadian Brothers* is a still weaker effort. Mrs Leprohon was a constant contributor in prose and verse to *The Literary Garland*, a periodical of some repute in the middle of the last century. Her novels are gracefully written, with some idea of construction, and no little discernment of character and motive. *Antoinette de Mirecourt* is the best of her eight books. Catharine Parr Traill and Susanna Moodie were sisters who diligently devoted themselves to writing. Mrs Traill, whose chief distinction was gained in natural history, wrote also several novels, of which *Lost in the Backwoods*, published in London in 1852, under the title *The Canadian Crusoes*, is the best. Her sister Mrs Moodie has been referred to for her interesting descriptions of pioneer life. James de Mille was prolific and popular in his day. His novels were extravagantly romantic.

William Kirby wrote the best Canadian novel, *Le Chien d'Or, or The Golden Dog*, published in 1877. It is an ambitious book, cast in a large historic mould. The scene is laid in the middle of the eighteenth century, and the actors of the drama are the notabilities of Quebec, with such subsidiary characters as are necessary to drive the plot along. Signs of an unpractised hand abound in the book, but its merits are very considerable.

William McLennan wrote two novels, a book of short stories and a useful volume of verse, *Songs of Old Canada*, translated from the French. *Spanish John*, his only independent novel, possesses much literary merit which, until recent years, has not been a conspicuous virtue among Canadian writers. *The Span o' Life*, written in collaboration, is a stirring tale of the days of prince Charlie. McLennan's collection of short stories *In Old France and New* is described in its title. His *habitant* tales are an interesting prose counterpart of the work of Drummond.

## CHAPTER XII

### THE LITERATURE OF AUSTRALIA AND NEW ZEALAND

THE British settlement in Australia began only in the last quarter of the eighteenth century; and, in the intervening years, an increasing but still small population has been chiefly engaged in agriculture and commerce. The class of settler needed for the development of the country was not one, who, as in the settlement of the American colonies, could carry with him to a new land the traditions and civilisation of the old. The labour of laying the material bases of prosperity was, for long, too severe to leave time for intellectual cultivation; and the country has enjoyed but little of the leisure which is favourable to the practice of literature. Nevertheless, both the quantity and quality of English literature produced in Australia give evidence of the vigour which is characteristic of the Australian. If Australian life and thought has no background of inherited romance and legend, it has its own tales of heroism, its own strong colour and other incentives to literary expression. Nature, here magnificently beautiful and there desolate and terrible; the exploration of vast deserts; the conflict with drought and storm; the turbulent period of the gold-diggings; the free life in sparsely populated country; the prevalence of horses; the neighbourhood of the sea and, in recent years, the passionate assertion of democratic liberty—all these have furnished material for literature, and, especially, for poetry, with distinctive characteristics. Australian poetry shows a prevalence of swinging metres, which suggest the movement of horses, or the roll of great waves. It consists largely of narrative and character-sketch. Much of it is genially humorous; together with a warm appreciation of heroism and devotion, it shows a delight in the odd types of character (and rascality) fostered by the conditions of life in a young country. Where it is serious, it frequently expresses a gloomy view of life, induced, perhaps, by the hardships and the uncertainty that attended the days of settlers, explorers and gold-diggers.

The earliest Australian poetry was rather an inheritance from Great Britain than a native growth. In 1819, Charles Lamb's

friend, Barron Field, who, in 1816, became judge of the supreme court of New South Wales, and remained in Australia till 1824, published in Sydney, for private circulation, *First Fruits of Australian Poetry*. In 1823, a born Australian, William Charles Wentworth, wrote in competition for the chancellor's medal at the university of Cambridge a poem entitled *Australasia*, which was printed in London and shortly afterwards appeared in the first Australian newspaper, *The Sydney Gazette*. In 1826, another Australian, Charles Tompson, junior, published in Sydney his poems, *Wild Notes from the Lyre of a Native Minstrel*. The names of Australian fauna and flora and references to the aboriginal races are found creeping further into English verse in the poems of John Dunmore Lang, a presbyterian divine, who arrived in New South Wales in 1823 and took a prominent part in Australian politics. His *Aurora Australis*, published in Sydney in 1826, is Australian at least in so far as it applies inherited modes of expression to the beauties and characteristics of his adopted country. Lang was not afraid to write :

At length an occupant was given  
To traverse each untrodden wild,  
The rudest mortal under Heaven,  
Stern Nature's long-forgotten child!  
Compatriot of the tall emu,  
The wombat and the kangaroo!

The decade 1840—1850, preceding the rush to the gold-diggings, was an important period in the history of Australian poetry. The development of New South Wales brought about an increase in the number of newspapers, and the newspapers gave opportunities for the publication of verse. Encouragement came, also, from Sir Henry Parkes, who, having emigrated to Australia in 1839 at the age of twenty-four, was enabled by his eminent position in the political life of New South Wales to foster the production of poetry. Parkes was, himself, a poet of some merit. Of the five volumes of verse which he published in Sydney, the earliest was issued in 1842; the best is probably the second, *Murmurs of the Stream*, which came out in 1857; but poetry was to him the recreation of a busy life, and his power of lyrical expression was not cultivated as it deserved. Other poets of the period were Daniel Henry Deniehy, a graceful singer; Richard P. L. Rowe, a journalist whose miscellaneous writings under the pseudonym 'Peter Possum' were very popular with Australian readers, and whose best poems show a subtle imagination and a delicate ear; Henry Halloran, a fluent and straightforward versifier, and J. Sheridan



Moore, who sang in easy style of Australian scenes. The same decade, moreover, saw the publication of his first volume of poetry by one whose work deserves more particular attention.

Charles Harpur may be considered the first distinctively Australian poet. He was a student of Wordsworth and of Shelley, and more than one of his lyric poems (for instance, that entitled *Words*) suggest that he had read the lyric poems of Blake. In this first volume, *Thoughts: a Series of Sonnets*, published in Sydney in 1845, there is little that might not have been written by one who had never seen Australia. The sonnets are well performed exercises in poetry, not devoid of the commonplaces of poetical diction, and, in spite of some fervour and fine imagination, seldom rising above a moderate level of merit. As time went on, Harpur, who was Australian born and spent much of his life in the bush, came to trust more, for subject and for inspiration, to what he himself felt and saw in his own life and surroundings. He was the first Australian poet to give a worthy imaginative representation of Australian scenery and nature. The largeness of his vision and the simplicity of his emotion suggest life in an undeveloped and sparsely populated country; and, while he practised many forms of lyrical poetry, he found his most suitable medium in blank verse narrative and description. *The Creek of the Four Graves* is the poem on which his fame is most firmly established, and it is essentially Australian. His play, *The Bushrangers*, published in 1853, is not a good play; but the volume in which it appeared and the volume called *The Tower of the Dream*, published in 1865, contain some thoughtful and learned verse.

The rush for gold, which began just after the middle of the last century, brought to Australia a great quantity of new life and enterprise, which attracted thither a few men of intellectual attainments. Among these was Richard Henry Horne (who, while in Australia changed his second name to Hengist), the author of *Orion*<sup>1</sup>, whose poetical works bear some traces of his seventeen years' residence in Australia. Horne's chief influence on Australian poetry, however, lay in the advice and encouragement which he gave to younger poets. The same is true of James Lionel Michael, who, soon after his arrival in Sydney, gave up the idea of gold-digging and began to practise his own profession of solicitor. Michael, a friend of John Everett Millais and a supporter of the pre-Raphaelite movement in English painting, was a man of fine intellect, and himself a ready and musical poet. His long narrative and partly autobiographical poem *John Cumberland*, which was

<sup>1</sup> See, *ante*, vol. XII, chap. v.

published in Sydney in 1860, flows easily along in varied metres, and, though an eccentric jumble of matter and manner, has qualities of grace and refinement; but poetry, and Australian poetry in particular, is less indebted to him for his own writings than for his fostering care of one of the two greatest Australian poets, Henry Clarence Kendall.

Kendall, born in Australia of English and Irish descent, was employed by Michael in boyhood as clerk and amanuensis, and to Michael is due the credit of having early discerned the boy's poetical promise. His poems were sent to Parkes, who published them in *The Empire*. Kendall was twenty-one years old when he published in Sydney, in 1862, his first volume, *Poems and Songs*. The book contained a good deal that was immature, and Kendall later tried to suppress it. But the promise in it is unmistakable; and so, in certain instances, is the achievement. One of the poems told in impressive fashion the story of the explorers Burke and Wills, who had recently perished. In spite of the opportunities granted by the newspapers, however, Australia was not in those days a good field for poetry. Mistrusting their own judgment, the Australian critics and reading public were inclined to condemn any literature that had not won the approval of the mother-country. Kendall, whose faith in his own powers was not yet shaken by his inherited weakness of character and his consequent unhappiness, boldly sent specimens of his work to *The Athenaeum*, which, on 27 September 1862, printed some of them with favourable comments, and on several later occasions gave space and praise to Kendall's work. This was the first recognition of Australian poetry by an English critical journal, and Kendall was greatly encouraged. He continued contributing poems to the newspapers and, seven years later, collected them, with a few from his *Poems and Songs*, in a volume entitled *Leaves from an Australian Forest*. Here he shows himself a true poet, and a truly Australian poet. Though he had spent some years in city life, which he disliked, his heart was always in the country; and he stands in his generation for the poet of the quieter side of Australian country life, and of the beauty of Australian forests, streams and mountains. His third notable volume was *Songs from the Mountains*, published in 1880. The intervening years had been clouded. In the later poems there are many touches of regret and remorse: on the other hand, some of the poetry of Kendall's last years reaches a strength and dignity unknown in his earlier work.

The best of his poetry is to be found in the three volumes

mentioned, for his efforts in satire and comic writing are negligible. Kendall was not a keen student of the great English poets of the past. His fancy was all for the writers of the nineteenth century; and some of his poetical weakness may be due to ignorance of the greatest models. At times, he seems to be merely an imitator, now of Poe, now of Longfellow, now of Moore. He is not strong in narrative, nor profound in perception of character. But there is grandeur in such poems as his blank verse address *To a Mountain*, and a fine lyrical quality in his poems of nature and of domestic joy or grief. A gentle, sensitive dreamer, he shows poetry at home in Australia, drawing beauty and sweetness from the poet's surroundings, without defiant or subservient glances at other lands.

Contemporary with Kendall, though some eight years older, was the most famous of all Australian poets, Adam Lindsay Gordon. Like Horne and Michael, Gordon, who arrived in Adelaide in 1853 at the age of twenty, brought to Australia a classical education and the traditions of a cultivated home. Through most of his varied, difficult and unhappy life, he was an eager reader of the great poets, from Homer to Swinburne. His poetry, however, was a more direct and personal expression of its author's own thoughts and feelings even than that of Kendall; and his thoughts and feelings were, far more than Kendall's, those of the majority of the Australians of his time.

The influence of old ballads, of Macaulay, of Browning, of Swinburne and others is patent in Gordon's metres and diction; it could scarcely be otherwise in the case of a poet with whom to read once attentively was to know by heart. But his poetry remains so personal in manner, and springs so directly out of his own mind and experience, that Kendall's poetry seems by comparison the fruit of culture. Opinion is divided as to whether Gordon is a distinctively Australian poet. One good Australian authority says: 'Beyond dispute Gordon is the national poet of Australia<sup>1</sup>'; another says: 'Gordon's work cannot be considered as peculiarly Australian in character<sup>2</sup>.' Unless the two statements are compatible, the popularity of Gordon's poetry in Australia, and the number of quotations from his work which are current in Australian speech would seem to imply that the former expresses the truth. As mounted trooper, as horse-breaker, as steeple-chase rider, as livery-stable keeper, Gordon spent most

<sup>1</sup> Humphris, E. and Sladen, D., *Adam Lindsay Gordon*, p. 254.

<sup>2</sup> Stevens, B., *The Golden Treasury of Australian Verse*, p. xxv.

of his Australian life among horses. He composed many of his poems while on horseback in the bush, and the rhythm of horse-hoofs seems to beat in most of his metres. Not letters but horses were his trade; and he sings not the dreams of a remote spirit, but the joys and sorrows, the hope and despair, the energy and the weariness of the man of action, concerned in the common life of his place and period. To English readers Adam Lindsay Gordon's poetry seems the very voice of Australia.

The reason of this is not any great prevalence of local colour in his writings. Most of his narrative and descriptive poems, such as *The Sick Stockrider* and *Wolf and Hound*, were written in the last year of his life, when his fame was achieved in Australia and rapidly growing in England. Apparently, his short sight prevented him from seeing many of the details of nature which give particularity to the descriptions of Kendall and other Australian poets. He was the poet of Australia because he was the poet of the sportsman and the adventurer. The youth whose wildness had unfitted him for English life found in the new country the proper field for his daring and high spirit. Partly owing to his own recklessness and extravagance and partly to a hereditary taint of melancholy, his life was unhappy, and he ended it by his own hand; but, in the saddle and out of it, he was adventurous, brave, 'a thorough sportsman.' His poetry is the voice of men who lead adventurous lives, who fight gallantly against long odds, and take defeat almost as a matter of course. It is melancholy in so far as it despairs of success or reward; but it is joyous in its love of the fight for its own sake.

Gordon was a poet from his youth. On leaving England, in 1853, he wrote a poem of farewell to home which already showed his characteristic pride and defiance. Some years, however, were to pass before he published anything of importance. In 1865, he contributed to *Bell's Life in Victoria* what purported to be merely one of the riming tips for horse-races that were not infrequent in that journal, but was, in fact, a fine poem, in which his passion for horses, for the sea and for life alike found expression. More of these racing poems followed; contemporary racing in Australia and memories of hunting and steeple-chasing in his youth at home supplied him with subjects during the remaining five years of his life. With the possible exception of Whyte Melville, whom he greatly admired and to whom he dedicated, in a beautiful poem, his volume *Bush Ballads*, Gordon is the only poet who has used sport as the medium for the

expression of his views on life. All his gallant, despairing philosophy finds voice in these poems; and, where other poets have turned to tales of ancient heroism at sea or on the battle-field, Gordon turned to a race-meeting. On these sporting poems, rather than on his reflective poems or his dramatic narratives, Gordon's popularity rests, not only in Australia but among English readers in all countries. And that popularity is deserved. The best of them have not only an irresistible fire and pace: Gordon, seeing sport as the best thing in life, could give dignity to its treatment, while his knowledge of poetry and his natural gifts made him a secure, if not an original, metrist.

Poems in *Bell's Life in Victoria* and in *The Australasian* came frequently from his pen; and, in 1867, he collected some of them into a volume, *Sea Spray and Smoke Drift*. The same year saw the issue of a long poem, *Ashtaroth*, partly founded on Goethe's *Faust*, which contains much that is characteristic of Gordon with very little that was of his best. In 1868, Marcus Clarke persuaded him to contribute poems to *The Colonial Monthly*, and he began with the mournful poem *Doubtful Dreams*. In 1869, full of trouble, he found refuge for a time at a friend's house, where he wrote his best dramatic lyrics, *The Sick Stockrider*, *The Ride from the Wreck*, *Wolf and Hound* and his most famous racing poem, *How we beat the Favourite*. In 1870, he published his volume *Bush Ballads and Galloping Rhymes* and, a few months later, died by his own hand.

Gordon occasionally handled old themes, and some of his ballads are stirring. Among his autobiographical poems, *Whisperings in Wattle-Boughs*, in which he looks back to his wild youth, is full of music and pathos. Many of his reflective poems finely express his ardent joy in activity and effort and his profound melancholy, although in these his metrical debt to Swinburne or another is more insistently noticeable than in his narratives or poems of sport. If Gordon is not a poet of the first rank, he is one in whom both the learned and the unlearned can take pleasure. His spirit of daring, of joy in the fight for the fight's sake, would appear to be alive yet in Australia; and there is much of Gordon, though there is no imitation of Gordon, in the frank feeling and defiant gladness of the recently published *Book of Anzac*, over which the Australasian soldiers in Gallipoli have made English readers laugh and weep.

To the same period as Gordon's poetry belong the comparatively few poetical works of Marcus Clarke, journalist, dramatist and

novelist, who wrote some pretty lyrics and clever parodies, and the earlier work of two poets of considerable merit, Thomas Bracken and Arthur Patchett Martin. Martin's lyrical poems are thoughtful and musical, tinged with the sadness of one who, in his youth, had high faith in freedom, but lost it as time went on. Bracken was a facile and rather sentimental poet, whose lyrics have more sweetness than strength. One of them, *Not Understood*, is widely known. Bracken was by birth a New Zealander, and not a few of his poems are based on Maori legends or history. The poet of the Maoris, however, is Alfred Domett, the friend of Robert Browning, who went to New Zealand in 1842 and lived there for nearly thirty years. Before leaving England, Domett had published poems, among them a long lyric on Venice (1839). His longest work, *Ranolf and Amohia*, he put forth after his return home in 1872. In a great variety of lyrical metres it describes the scenery of New Zealand and narrates a story of Maori life. Had these been Domett's only objects in writing the poem, he would probably have left a better memorial of his undeniable poetic gift. His descriptions of the romantic scenery of the islands and the mythology and customs of the Maoris are often very beautiful and interesting. In the prefatory poem he says:

Well, but what if there gleamed in an Age cold as this,  
The divinest of Poets' ideals of bliss?  
Yea, an Eden could lurk in this Empire of ours,  
With the loneliest love in the loveliest bowers.

The answer he gives is convincing: but he had a further object which interfered with the success of his work. He wanted to talk about theism and positivism; and, though his philosophising is very interesting in itself, his disquisitions break the flow of his poem. Domett's last volume, *Flotsam and Jetsam*, published in 1877, contains many beautiful descriptions of places which he had visited in his European travels, and some glowing expressions of his opinions and hopes.

To the period of Kendall and Gordon belongs also the earlier work of the Queensland poet, James Brunton Stephens, a Scot who went to Australia in 1866. The popularity of Stephens rests chiefly on his humorous poems, such as *To a Black Gin* and *Universally Respected*; and these vigorous and hearty sketches make him the Bret Harte of Australia. They do not, however, show his talent at its best. Stephens is a poet of great strength and fine imagination. His first poem, *Convict Once*, is a tale of

remarkable power and gloom; and among his lyrics are several which, for their music and their passion, are much to be prized. Technically, Stephens is noteworthy for his strong handling of dactylic metres. Another good Queensland poet, George Essex Evans, belongs to a later date, since his first volume was not published till 1891. Evans shared Stephens's lofty belief in the destinies of Australia. His *Australian Symphony* and his patriotic poems are full of passion for his country and of a more manful and ambitious love of it than Kendall or any other Australian poet had expressed. His long narrative poem, *The Repentance of Magdalene Despar*, is strong and tragic, and in his lyric poems he shows a command of original metres and cadences and a choice fancy.

In the decade 1880—90, there began a new era in Australian poetry, possibly due, in some measure, to the new pride and confidence which was the natural result of the increased interest in Australia after the International Exhibition at Melbourne in 1880—1 and the Colonial and Indian Exhibition in London in 1886. At any rate, it is the poetry of a civilised country, with leisured and cultivated inhabitants. The poems of Philip Joseph Holdsworth, of Francis Adams, of James Lister Cuthbertson, of Robert Richardson, of William Gay, of Grace Jennings Carmichael, of Barcroft Henry Boake and of Victor James Daley show poetry firmly established in Australia, well received by a public that can judge for itself, and flowering with a peculiar vigour. It is the poetry of refined and cultivated minds; but it is free from wilful strangeness and from any native or imported taints of morbidity. Meanwhile, John Farrell had set the vogue for racy, free-and-easy poetry of common life, which his successors are practising with greater skill and verisimilitude than himself. In origin it doubtless owes something to Bret Harte: but it is enriching the English language with vigorous colloquial expressions, and providing readers with excitement and amusement.

The best literary genius of Australia turns to poetry; but good work has been done in fiction. Henry Kingsley's *Geoffrey Hamlyn*, though a story of Australia, founded on the author's experiences during his brief stay in the colony, can scarcely be considered a novel of Australian origin; and William Howitt's *A Boy's Adventures in the Wilds of Australia* stands in the same category. Perhaps the earliest properly Australian novels were *Clara Morison* and others by Catherine Helen Spence, who was better known as a political writer; and Charles Rowcroft's colonial

stories showed that Australian fiction was struggling into being. With the fiction of Marcus Clarke a further stage is reached. His novel *Heavy Odds* is now negligible; but his chief work, *His Natural Life*, is not only a vivid and carefully substantiated tale of a penal settlement, but a powerful work of fiction. Between its serial publication in *The Australian Journal* and its issue as a book in 1874, Clarke revised his story, with the assistance, it is said, of Sir Charles Gavan Duffy; and in its final form, though a gloomy and horrible tale, it is one of the best works of fiction that have been produced in Australia. Clarke's shorter stories of Australian life in the bush and the town, idyllic, humorous or tragic, are also good and sincere pieces of fiction. The next eminent name on the list of Australian novelists is Thomas Alexander Browne, who, under the pseudonym 'Rolf Boldrewood,' won wide popularity both in his own country and in Great Britain. Boldrewood was a squatter, a police magistrate and a warder of goldfields; and he knew thoroughly the life that he described. Those who are in a position to speak on the subject say that *The Squatter's Dream* and *A Colonial Reformer* are the best pictures extant of the squatter's life. To English readers, Boldrewood is best known by *Robbery Under Arms*, the story of the bushranger, Captain Starlight, which was published as a book in 1888, some years after its serial issue in *The Sydney Mail*, and *The Miner's Right*, published in 1890. In these four novels lies the best of Rolf Boldrewood's work. The two last mentioned contain plenty of exciting incident; but these tales of bushranging, of gold-digging and of squatting have little in common with the merely sensational fiction of which, it must be admitted, Australia has produced a plentiful crop. They are the work of a keen observer and a man of sound commonsense. If the character-drawing is simple, it is true to nature and to the life described; and, though a finer artist in fiction would have drawn the threads of the stories closer, Boldrewood's vigour in narrative and breezy fancy give life and interest to these faithful pictures of times that are gone. Compared with Rolf Boldrewood, the many novels of Guy Boothby, though exciting in incident, are poor in conception and slipshod in execution, and the novels of Benjamin Leopold Farjeon will count for little in the development of Australian fiction.

Travel and exploration in Australasia have been the subject of many books, most of which were written by Englishmen; the subject has been admirably summarised by Julian Edmund Tenison



Woods, the friend of Adam Lindsay Gordon, in his *History of the Discovery and Exploration of Australia*, published in 1865. The historians and political writers of Australia have appealed almost entirely in the past to a special audience; but the foundations of future work in these fields have been firmly laid. In 1819, W. C. Wentworth published a *Description of New South Wales and Van Diemen's Land*, which fiercely attacked the existing form of government. Among the many writings of John Dunmore Lang, there is a discursive and confusing *Historical and Statistical Account of New South Wales*, first published in 1834 and reissued, with new matter, in 1852 and 1875. Samuel Bennett's accurate and lucid *History of Australian Discovery and Colonization*, published in 1867, brings the story down to 1831. William Westgarth began his important series of reports and books on Australian history and politics with a report on the aborigines issued in 1846. They include *Australia Felix; an Account of the Settlement of Port Philip* (1843); *Victoria, late Australia Felix* (1853); and *Victoria and the Australian Goldmines in 1857* (1857); while his *Personal Recollections of Early Melbourne and Victoria* (1888) and *Half-a-Century of Australian Progress; a personal Retrospect* (1889) are full of interest and knowledge. The decade 1850—60 saw the publication of some of William Howitt's accounts of Australian life and affairs, and of R. H. Horne's very lively and amusing *Australian Facts and Prospects*, which was prefaced by the author's *Australian Autobiography*, a vivid account of his adventures as gold-escort in the early days of the diggings. James Bonwick's chief interest in life was the compiling of his invaluable collections of facts bearing upon early colonial history, and his *Last of the Tasmanians* and *Daily Life and Origin of the Tasmanians*, both published in 1870, are important contributions to anthropology. Alexander Sutherland's sumptuous work on *Victoria and its Metropolis*, published in 1888, is the leading work of its kind in a later period.

Finally, mention should be made of Australian journalism, which has from the first been vigorous and prolific, and has contrived to be independent and vivacious without stooping, in any marked degree, to scurrility or vulgarity. The Australian newspapers have not only recorded and commented upon the interesting and exciting development of the country; they have provided opportunities to poets, occasional essayists and writers of fiction who might otherwise have found no field for their self-expression.

## CHAPTER XIII

### SOUTH AFRICAN POETRY

To give in brief, and yet in true perspective, a summary of the poetical literature of South Africa is no easy task, not because the material is large, but for the very opposite reason. It is very limited, but its parts are disproportioned and incommensurable. It is like a geological system which is full of 'faults,' the earlier strata being cut off by cataclysms from the later. The greatest of these cataclysms is the war of 1899—1902, which produced a crop of poetry of its own, and was followed by later developments which, as the work of living authors, do not fall within the scope of this chapter.

But there had been lesser wars and lesser convulsions before that great struggle. The chief advantage of the war just named, so far as literature was concerned, was to make the scene and the main features of the country familiar and intelligible to the general reader. The kopje and the kloof, the veldt and the vlei, the Karroo and the Drakenberg, the Modder, the Vaal and the Orange, became household words. But the earlier poetry had dealt with the same country in quite a different way. To show this in detail and connectedly, to give any continuous and representative account of that poetry, is difficult; for the material is both scanty and scattered. Some day, it may be done by a critic on the spot, who has access to the remains, such as they are, contained, as everyone acquainted with South African literature says, in files of forgotten newspapers, in the dry-as-dust pages of old Cape magazines and journals, and who can trace by family tradition or documents the history and circumstances of the writers. Meanwhile, the present section must be regarded as 'autoschediastic,' a first essay, an attempt rather to indicate the lie of the land than to cover the whole ground.

Rudyard Kipling, himself, in a sense, the foremost English

poet of South Africa, when asked what South African poetry there was beside his own, replied :

As to South African verse, it's a case of there's Pringle, and there's Pringle, and after that one must hunt the local papers. There is also, of course, F. W. Reitz's *Afrikaanse Gedigte*, songs and parodies in the Taal, which are very characteristic.

Roughly speaking, this is a pretty fair summary of the earlier South African poetry; but it includes 'Cape-Dutch' verse, which does not come within our purview. Kipling's judgment was confirmed independently by a living South African writer, R. C. Russell, himself a poet, who wrote: 'There do not appear to have been any poets of note between Pringle's time and the generation which has just passed away.'

The first thing to do, then, is to give some account of Pringle. Thomas Pringle is called by the South Africans themselves 'the father of their poetry.' He was a remarkable man, and in every sense of the word, a pioneer. A somewhat younger contemporary of Wordsworth, Coleridge and Scott, a nearer contemporary of Byron, Shelley and Keats, he fell under the influences of the former group. Born in 1789, near Kelso, the son of a border-farmer, he achieved a literary position in Edinburgh, gaining the friendship of Sir Walter Scott and the acquaintance of the Edinburgh *literati*, and became editor of *The Edinburgh Monthly Magazine*, now *Blackwood's Magazine*. His first volume of poems was published in 1819; but literature proved unremunerative, and he decided to emigrate to South Africa, and went out to Cape Town in that year. He settled his family in the bush, and then, with a friend, attempted to achieve a literary career in Cape Town, being appointed, through the influence of Sir Walter Scott and others, librarian of the government library. He made a promising start in this office, but was ruined by quarrelling with the governor, lord Charles Somerset, and in particular by making, as Scott said, 'the mistake of trying to bring out a whig paper in Cape Town.' After a farewell visit to his friends in the bush, he returned to London to seek redress, but without avail. He associated himself with the men who were working for the abolition of slavery, notably with Wilberforce, Coleridge and Clarkson, but fell ill just when his labours for abolition were reaching success, in the summer of 1834, and died in London in the same year at the early age of forty-six. In that year, besides a new edition of his poems, he published a prose work, *Narrative of a Residence in South Africa*, which he was revising

just before his death. It was a striking work, and made much impression. Its influence may be read in the wellknown lines of *Locksley Hall*:

Slowly comes a hungry people, as a lion creeping nigher,  
Glares at one that nods and winks behind a slowly dying fire;

which, Tennyson records, were suggested to him by a passage in Pringle's book.

Coleridge expressed a very high opinion of Pringle's poems. Little known in Scotland or England, they have had a great and a good influence in South Africa. As a recent South African poet, Vine Hall, sings:

Pringle, we love thy scorn of wrong,  
Thy simple, heartfelt song,  
A knightly soul unbought and unafraid,  
This country oweth much to thy two-edged blade.

The characteristics of his spirit, as shown in his poetry, were love of freedom, personal and public, love of the native, love of nature, and an old-fashioned refinement and classic taste. An Edinburgh student, he quotes his Lucretius and his Vergil, and uses his Latin phrases with practised skill. These characteristics were no small inheritance to South Africa. It is not easy to select from his poems, for, though faithful and sincere, and written with an eye on the objects, they are somewhat faint in hue and at times diffuse. The *Songs of the Emigrants* are an echo of the then new and fashionable poem, Byron's *Childe Harold*, including an imitation of his 'Adieu, adieu, my native land.'

More original and of more permanent interest as a graphic and vivid picture of the Cape Colony of those days, still the unsubdued home of the wild beast, long since driven far toward the equator, is *Afar in the Desert*. This was pronounced by Coleridge to be one of the two or three most perfect lyric poems in the language. Its opening lines carry the reader at once into the midst of its scene:

Afar in the Desert I love to ride  
With the silent Bushboy alone by my side,  
Away, away, from the dwellings of men,  
By the wild deer's haunt, by the buffalo's glen,  
By valleys remote where the oribi plays,  
Where the gnu, the gazelle and the hartebeest graze,  
And the koodoo and eland untamed recline  
By the skirts of grey forests o'er-hung with wild vine,

Where the elephant browses at peace in his wood,  
 And the river-horse gambols unscared in the flood,  
 And the mighty rhinoceros wallows at will,  
 In the fen where the wild ass is drinking his fill.

No wonder that it has been translated into Cape Dutch, and is loved by both races alike<sup>1</sup>.

The spirited *Lion Hunt*, a poetic sketch by a poet who, like Homer, had seen real lions and real hunts, ends with an allusion to Sir Walter Scott:

His head, with the paws, and the bones of his skull,  
 With the spoils of the leopard and buffalo bull,  
 We'll send to Sir Walter: Now boys let us dine,  
 And talk of our deeds o'er a flask of old wine!

And Pringle added a note that this intention had actually been carried out, and that, in 1834, the trophies 'had the honour to form part of the ornaments of the lamented poet's antique armoury at Abbotsford.'

*The Lion and Giraffe* is also an exceedingly graphic snapshot of a scene which Pringle, if he had not witnessed it, had heard described at first hand, and displays all his powers of imagination, observation and description. But the piece, perhaps, which more than any other marks this pious Scottish farmer's son for a real literary artist, the brother at once of Burns and Scott and Livingstone, is *The Bechuana Boy*. This touching and beautiful piece, part fact, part fiction, truth arranged with art, was based on the story of a Bechuana orphan boy, who had been carried off from his native country by the mountain tribes, half-bred Hottentots, and who fell under Pringle's protection. The touch of the pet springbok was suggested to Pringle by his seeing, a few days afterwards, a slave child playing with a fawn at a farmer's residence. The real little African boy brought by Pringle and his wife to England became their devoted protégé and almost adopted child, but died, like many at that time, of an affection of the lungs.

I sat at noontide in my tent,  
 And looked across the Desert dun,  
 Beneath the cloudless firmament  
 Far gleaming in the sun.

<sup>1</sup> *Ver in de Wildernis*, a rendering by F. W. Reitz, a poet of mark, who was president of the Orange Free State in the years 1889 to 1896, is a most successful effort and indeed a significant token of the essential affinity of the two races. Nowhere, perhaps, is this better shown than in the last line, practically identical in both tongues:

*Want ver is der mensch, MAAR GOD IS NABY.*

When from the bosom of the waste  
 A swarthy stripling came in haste  
 With foot unshod and naked limb;  
 And a tame springbok followed him.

With open aspect, frank yet bland,  
 And with a modest mien he stood,  
 Caressing with a gentle hand  
 That beast of gentle brood;  
 Then meekly gazing in my face,  
 Said in the language of his race  
 With smiling look yet pensive tone,  
 'Stranger—I'm in the world alone!'

\* \* \* \* \*

'Thus lived I, a lone orphan lad,  
 My task the proud Boor's flocks to tend;  
 And this poor fawn was all I had  
 To love, or call my friend;  
 When suddenly, with haughty look  
 And taunting words, that tyrant took  
 My playmate for his pampered boy,  
 Who envied me my only joy.

'High swelled my heart! But when a star  
 Of midnight gleamed, I softly led  
 My bounding favourite forth, and far  
 Into the Desert fled.  
 And here, from human kind exiled,  
 Three moons on roots and berries wild  
 I've fared; and braved the beasts of prey,  
 To 'scape from spoilers worse than they.

'But yester morn a Bushman brought  
 The tidings that thy tents were near,  
 And now with hasty foot I've sought  
 Thy presence, void of fear:  
 Because they say, O English Chief,  
 Thou scornest not the Captive's grief:  
 Then let me serve thee, as thine own—  
 For I am in the world alone!'

Such was Marossi's touching tale,  
 Our breasts they were not made of stone;  
 His words, his winning looks prevail—  
 We took him for 'our own.'  
 And One, with woman's gentle art  
 Unlocked the fountains of his heart;  
 And love gushed forth—till he became  
 Her Child in everything but name.

Many other pieces testify sympathetically to the noble, indeed often heroic, character of the Kaffirs, and to their capacity both for poetry and religion, elements not to be forgotten in any account of South African poetry. Such are *The Ghona Widow's*

*Lullaby* with its quotation from the famous *Ntsikana's Hymn*, or *The Captive of Camalu* or *The Koranna*.

Pringle then, is historic, and anyone who wishes to know what the colour and circumstances of South African life were at the beginning of the last century will find it nowhere so well as in his book. Some of the pieces in it to which reference has been made may remind us that South Africa is the home of at least two white and many black races, and that in various ways all these appear in its literature. A volume published as long ago as 1884, entitled *Klaas Gezwint en Zijn Paert*, contains not only specimens of Pringle's poems, but verses by a number of other verse writers of that and previous generations. The first piece in the volume, *The British Settler's Song*, composed by an early settler, A. G. Bain, and sung by him at the Settlers' Commemoration Dinner at Graham's Town, bears the stamp of its era upon it, and is very characteristic.

So, too, is the next piece, *The Africander's War Song*, an adaptation of *A' the Blue Bonnets are over the Border*, beginning:

March! March! Cabo and Caledon!

Mount your fleet steeds, they are sleek—in good order.

March, march, Stellenbosch, Swellendam,

Every brave Burgher must off to the Border!

Two others, written as companion poems, entitled *Cutting Capers* and *Caper Sauce*, comparing, or contrasting the advantage of England and Cape Colony, give a lively picture of some prominent features. The second and most unique portion of the volume, the *Volk's Liedereren*, or poems in the Taal or Cape Dutch, to which reference has already been made, we must here unwillingly pass by. Many of them are parodies of wellknown English and Scottish pieces, especially the latter. *The Maid of Athens* appears as *Sannie Beyers*; *The Laird of Cockpen* as *Gert Beyers*; *Duncan Gray* as *Daantjie Gouws*; *The Cotter's Saturday Night* as *Die Boer zijn Zaterdag Aand*, and *Tam o' Shanter* as the piece which gives its title to the volume, *Klaas Gezwint*<sup>1</sup>.

The best collection of English South African poetry is *The Treasury of South African Poetry and Verse*, collected from various sources and arranged by Edward Heath Crouch, of Cambridge, South Africa. The first edition, published in 1907, almost at once sold out, and a second edition followed the next

<sup>1</sup> A later volume containing pieces of a similar character but more original, is *Grappige Stories en Andere Versies in Kaaps-Hollands (Comic Tales and other Verses in Cape Dutch)*, by Melt J. Brink, published in 1893.

year. It is divided into two sections, the longer secular portion, and a smaller collection at the end of 'religious and metaphysical' poems. Several of the authors, Pringle amongst them, appear in both. Fortunately for themselves, but unfortunately for the purpose of this brief survey, the authors of many of the best pieces contained in this collection are still alive, and cannot therefore be treated here.

Among those who have passed away may be mentioned John Fairbairn, the contemporary and friend of Pringle, whom the latter invited to join him at the Cape. Pringle thought well of his poetry, quoting in his autobiography more than one of Fairbairn's pieces and ranking them above his own; and expressed a regret that one who had written so well had written so little.

A poet of some merit, with an eye and voice for the characteristics of South African nature, was E. B. Watermeyer. Some lines of his, happily prefixed to the Dutch collection mentioned above, are well worth remembering:

'English are you? or Dutch?  
Both; neither;' How?  
The land I dwell in Dutch and English plough.  
Together they have been in weal and woe;  
Together they have stood to breast the foe;  
A name of future days, in Time's far scope  
May tell perhaps the nation of 'Good Hope'!

A sea piece by the same writer entitled *After a Storm*, is a sincere and appealing study of nature.

Another poet of more variety and range is A. Haynes Bell. His *Knight of Avelon* is a romantic story in the manner of Tennyson, and a skilful and pleasing poem in that style. The poem, *To a Sea Conch*, is also early, or middle, Victorian, with perhaps some echo of Longfellow and Oliver Wendell Holmes. A martial piece, *The Last Stand*, is interesting as being one of the earlier South African poems of empire:

Comrades, wake! 'tis morn!  
See, the foe draws near!  
Britons we were born,  
Britons then appear!  
Death we laugh to scorn;  
Shame alone we fear.

There are many, true;  
We are but a score,  
But, though we are few,  
Honour makes us more;  
So we'll count anew  
When the fight is o'er.



Now for all we love—  
King, and Empire, friends;  
Now for God above,  
Who the right defends.  
Strike, nor recreant prove  
To our Country's ends.

Freedom, justice, peace,  
These we bring to all.  
'Tis our faith too; these  
Are our Empire's wall.  
Grow with its increase,  
Perish with its fall.

'Tis a sacred cause  
Summons to the fray;  
Not for vain applause  
Or the fame we pray.  
For our Country's laws  
Stand we here to-day.

Stern will be the strife;  
Let us do or die.  
Honour's more than life,  
More than victory.  
More than children, wife;  
Let us do or die.

Each, then, do his part;  
Fight, lads, with a will.  
Many a gallant heart  
Will the tidings thrill;  
Many a tear will start  
To our memory still.

And should we prevail,  
As by grace we may,  
What a shout will hail  
This triumphant day!  
How the foe will quail!  
What will England say?

Steady, lads! lie low!  
See, the foe appears.  
Let us treat him now  
To three British cheers;  
Then the victor's brow  
Or a nation's tears.

The influence of Tennyson, as was only natural, may be traced in much of the poetry of South Africa at this period. He had a great vogue there. A friend of the writer of this chapter, who knew South Africa well and who lost his life in the South African war, told of an old Boer farmer who, when his last days came,

wandered down to a stream on his farm, and was heard repeating the wellknown verses of *The Rivulet* :

No more by thee my steps shall be,  
For ever and for ever.

When Cecil Rhodes himself lay dying he quoted, as many will remember, the words of *In Memoriam* :

So little done, so much to do.

But perhaps still more striking testimony was that rendered by a divine of the Dutch church, H. S. Bosman, who shortly after the war, preached a remarkable sermon at Johannesburg, in July 1902, advocating the keeping alive of the Dutch ideals, and who, when called in question, justified himself by quoting a passage from Tennyson's *Cup*, beginning :

Sir, if a State submit  
At once, she may be blotted out at once,  
And swallow'd in the conqueror's chronicle.  
Whereas in wars of freedom and defence  
The glory and grief of battle won and lost  
Solders a race together.

To the influence of Tennyson succeeded naturally that of another poet, who has spent much time in the country, knows it, and is known by it, well. But of Rudyard Kipling and his influence on many, if not most, of the living poets of this part of the empire it is not permissible to take this occasion of speaking.

Suffice it, therefore, to say that in letters as in action, in poetry as in politics and war, South Africa shows today the promise and the potency of achievement worthy of its own growing greatness and of the still vaster empire, and the noble aspirations, for which it has given, and is giving, at this hour, its best blood, and the travail alike of its sword and its soul.

## CHAPTER XIV

### EDUCATION

THE latter half of the eighteenth century was marked by an hitherto unprecedented development of science. Mathematics, physics and astronomy made notable advances, the foundations of modern chemistry were laid, the idea of biological evolution was being carefully studied a century before the appearance of Darwin's *Origin of Species* (1859); the speculations of the early French economists were focused in Adam Smith's *Wealth of Nations* (1776). But the most striking results of scientific research and experiment were to be found in the applied sciences and in mechanical inventions. From the later years of George II onwards, there was an extraordinary growth in the number of labour-saving machines, more especially of those employed in the cotton and woollen industries, inventions which multiplied almost incalculably the resources of the manufacturing districts of the north and middle of England. On the heels of these inventions came the work of great engineers, Watt, Boulton, Rennie, Stephenson. The enormous economy of labour, the much greater mechanical precision of the output and the increased facility of transport, all combined to bring about an industrial expansion, which, assisted by the commercial activity of the earlier part of the century, was deep enough and broad enough to merit the name 'revolution.' Amidst such circumstances, it was inevitable that the critics of contemporary education should condemn its almost absolute disregard of useful knowledge and of modern studies.

A new people and a new order of civilised society appeared. Population increased, great urban communities arose in the midlands and in northern England, there was a general movement away from the rural districts; a hitherto unwonted aggregation of capital altered the scale of industrial operations. While wealth increased, so, also, did poverty; it would be difficult to parallel in the previous history of England the wretched state of the

labouring poor during the last years of the eighteenth and the first decades of the nineteenth century. The educational provision for the mass of English children in charity, parish and Sunday schools was very insufficient, and commonly unsuitable in character. The desperate plight of parents and the unsparing employment of children in mills and factories would, in many cases, have made the offer of a complete provision little more than a mockery. Yet, these very conditions of ignorance and of moral degradation stirred the hearts of reformers to attempt their alleviation by means of schools. The evils and their remedy are both described by Wordsworth in the last two books of *The Excursion* (1795—1814).

The activity directed to educational affairs, which has been a prominent feature of English life during recent years, dates from the time of the French revolution; but, at the moment of that outbreak, France and Germany could look back upon a whole generation engaged in revolutionising national education. By the publication of *La Nouvelle Héloïse* (1761), Rousseau had protested against the prevailing rationalism, and, in the following year, he produced *Émile*, a book whose destructive and constructive proposals combined to make it the most considerable work of the eighteenth century dealing with its subject. La Chalotais and Basedow had enunciated the administrative principles of the lay school and undenominational religious teaching, while the attacks upon the Society of Jesus and its eventual suppression by papal bull in 1773 had suspended the labours of the greatest educational corporation of the time, and had inflicted a fatal blow upon the type of instruction which, for some two and a half centuries, had been general throughout Europe. Prussia, under the guidance of K. A. von Zedlitz, Frederick the great's minister of education, had initiated reforms, which made her, in this respect, the model for the German people. So early as 1763, Frederick had decreed compulsory instruction and the provision of primary schools; ten years later, F. E. von Rochow had shown how rural schools of that order could be usefully conducted. In 1781, the modern German classical school, pursuing a course of study not confined to Latin and Greek, came into being with the curriculum which Gedike introduced in Berlin. Within the same decade, Prussian schools other than primary passed from ecclesiastical control to that of a specially constituted board of education, and, by the institution (1789) of the 'leaving examination,' the first advance was made in the evolution of the modern German university.

Austria and other regions of catholic Germany had entered upon a path of reform with purposes similar to those of Prussia; but these steps were rapidly retraced during the reaction which followed the events of 1789 in France. Outside Germany, but amidst a German-speaking population, Pestalozzi had completed the inconclusive experiment in rural education which he had been conducting upon his farm, Neuhof (1774—80).

The philosophy, psychology and, in a less degree, the educational doctrines which Europe had learned from John Locke lay behind the greater part of this strenuous activity; yet the external history of English education during the period 1760—90 exhibits a complete contrast with that of her continental neighbours. Oxford, Cambridge and the public schools, as a whole, were educating a smaller number of men and boys than had resorted to them in the days of Anne. At Oxford, in the first quarter of the eighteenth century, the number of boys admitted often exceeded 300; it never reached that number between 1726 and 1810, while it often fell below 200 in the mid-century<sup>1</sup>. A similar decline occurred at Cambridge, and at both universities there was a fall in the number of those who graduated, which is not fully accounted for by the diminished tale of freshmen.

An agitation for the relaxation of all formal professions of religious belief had been carried on since the middle of the century by a numerically small but active group of clergymen. At the universities, the movement led to repeated attempts between 1771 and 1787 to free bachelors of arts from subscription to the Thirty-Nine Articles or from a statement of adherence to the church of England. These attempts failed, and, as a consequence, Oxford and Cambridge degrees remained closed to the conscientious dissenter, whose membership of a college could only be maintained, if at all, by subterfuge.

The statutory exercises for degrees represented a system of education which had long been obsolete, and the toleration of a merely formal compliance with the requirements had reduced the exercises to farce<sup>2</sup>. The proportion of fellow-commoners and gentlemen-commoners amongst the undergraduates was large; and, as a class, these young men of birth and wealth furnished an element of idleness and dissipation which only intensified evils

<sup>1</sup> Brodrick, G. C., *Memorials of Merton College*.

<sup>2</sup> These are described, with some natural exaggeration of phrase, in a *locus classicus* of Knox, Vicesimus, *Essays, Moral and Literary* (1782), vol. 1, pp. 331 ff., 'On some parts of the discipline in our English universities.'

already too common in both universities. Vicesimus Knox, who was at Oxford from 1771 to 1778, and fellow of St John's college from 1775, asserted, in his *Liberal Education* (1781), that to send a son to either university without the safeguard of a private tutor would probably 'make shipwreck of his learning, his morals, his health and his fortune.' Yet boys of fifteen often became undergraduates. Many of the professors never lectured, and some did not make up for the omission by advancing knowledge in other ways. Those of them who did offer this compensation might fairly urge that the business of instructing the majority of those *in statu pupil-lari* was efficiently performed by the college tutors. The others were not likely to feel abashed in a predominantly clerical society where the pluralist and the absentee holder of a benefice were familiar figures. But the neglect of teaching by those whom the university had especially appointed for that purpose was the consequence of a process—the supersession of the university by its colleges—which had been going on for two centuries. Concurrently, Oxford and Cambridge, for the greater number of their residents, were becoming places of education rather than seats of learning. The change is reflected in *A Letter to Lord North*, which Knox addressed to the Oxford chancellor in 1789. This pamphlet suggested the intervention of parliament, and advocated a stricter discipline, a diminution of personal expenses, the strengthening of the collegiate system, an increase in the number of college tutors, the cost to be met by doubling tuition fees and abolishing 'useless' professors, with confiscation of their endowments. College tutors were to exercise a parental control over their pupils, and professors not of the 'useless' order were to lecture thrice weekly in every term, or resign. Long after this letter was written, Cambridge undergraduates who broke rules were subject to the schoolboy punishment of 'learning lines' by heart.

But, even in this period of stagnation, reformers and some reforms were not wanting within the universities themselves. At Cambridge, the written examinations held in the Senate house reduced the ancient exercises in the schools to mere forms of no intrinsic importance; although the latter survived till 1839, the Senate house examination from 1780 onwards set the standard and determined the direction of academic study. At this time, there was but one tripos, the examination including natural religion, moral philosophy and 'Locke' as well as mathematics, the last being the dominant and characteristic part of the test; some contemporary critics believed that the effect of the tripos

upon schools was to depreciate classical, in favour of mathematical learning<sup>1</sup>. Between 1773 and 1776, John Jebb, of Peterhouse, made several unsuccessful attempts to bring about an annual examination by the university of all its undergraduates; his persistent agitation is evidence of impatience with the obsolete forms which hindered progress in both universities. Knox, when proposing a similar scheme to lord North, made the proviso that examinations 'should be conducted with such delicacy as not to hurt the feelings of the diffident and modest.' Oxford's agitation for the reconstitution of the exercises for a degree was closed in 1800 by the passing of the Public Examination statute.

During the third quarter of the century, prizes for Latin essays and for Greek and Latin odes and epigrams were founded, an evidence of decline in literary arts which had long been practised in both universities. But a quite different purpose led to the foundation at Cambridge of the Townshend's prize for an English essay on an economic question (1755—6), the crown endowment of the chair of chemistry (1766), the Jacksonian professorship of 'natural and experimental philosophy' (1783) and the chair of the laws of England (1788). At Oxford, the Radcliffe observatory dates from 1777 and the Rawlinson professorship of Anglo-Saxon from 1795. It is significant of the time that the Cambridge professor of chemistry (Farish) treated his subject in its application 'to the arts and manufactures of Britain,' 'a new and useful field of instruction'; his prospectus of lectures for 1793 is a miscellaneous programme of applied science in general. Unofficial teachers then resident in Cambridge offered opportunity for the study of modern languages. William Gooch, second wrangler in 1791, who sailed in that year for the Pacific on a boundaries' commission, proposed to take with him not only mathematical books, but also works in Latin, Greek, French, Italian and Spanish; he learned the last from Isola, Gray's tutor in Italian.

During the second half of the eighteenth century, nonconformist academies<sup>2</sup> decreased in number, and the attempt to make them places of general education, released from particular denominational or professional ties, did not succeed. Some of their teachers were men of distinguished attainments, of whom Joseph Priestley, in early life a tutor in the Warrington academy, was the greatest and most versatile. Their readiness to experiment with

<sup>1</sup> Ingram, R. A., *The necessity of introducing divinity,* etc. (1792); *Remarks upon the enormous expense,* etc. (1783).

<sup>2</sup> See, *ante*, vol. ix, pp. 392—5, and vol. x, pp. 381—3.

new courses of study was even more pronounced than it had been a century earlier. But, at a time when, in spite of ancient prestige and material advantages, the universities failed to inspire public confidence, the new institutions suffered from disabilities of their own. Their teachers were too few to treat efficiently the wide range of studies attempted, and students were seldom able enough to digest an encyclopaedic curriculum. In consequence, there was a toleration of the superficial which may have contributed to prevent the academies from becoming instruments of university reform; and their acceptance of the position of theological seminaries for the training of ministers, a position which they had always partially occupied, removed them finally from the main current of national education. Nevertheless, they had done good service in the cause of history, literature and modern studies, particularly in respect of science and those forms of knowledge which are immediately applicable to the affairs of daily life<sup>1</sup>. Thomas Barnes, afterwards principal of the Manchester academy, with the support of the newly established Literary and Philosophical society of that town founded (1783) a college of Arts and Science, which anticipated, in a humble way, the scientific and technical work of modern universities and university colleges<sup>2</sup>.

At the public schools, the studies and the method of education remained in substance the same as they were in the earlier period described in a former volume<sup>3</sup>. The interesting point in their history is the prominent social place now assumed for the first time by Harrow, under a succession (1760—1805) of former Eton masters, Sumner, Heath and Drury, and by Rugby under another Etonian, Thomas James (1778—94). The number of boys in residence fluctuated considerably during the second half of the eighteenth century, and in some schools that number, at the close of the century, was very much less than it had been at the beginning. Westminster, Winchester and, in particular, Shrewsbury, are cases in point. Cowper's incomplete and prejudiced picture of the public school, which he drew in *Tirocinium*, was less true in the year 1785, when the poem appeared, than in his own school-days (1741—9); but the character of turbulence ascribed by the poet to public school education was well deserved at both the later and the earlier period. The stock question addressed by George III to Etonians whom he chanced to meet—

<sup>1</sup> See Priestley's *Miscellaneous Observations* (1778).

<sup>2</sup> Thompson, J., *The Owens College* (1886), introductory chapter.

<sup>3</sup> See, *ante*, vol. ix, pp. 408 ff.



'Have you had any rebellions lately, eh? eh?'—might have been put quite as aptly to any public school boy of the time. From 1770, when the Riot act was read to the Wykehamists, down to 1832, when Keate suppressed his last rebellion at Eton, there was a constant recurrence of these outbreaks; insubordination was met by arbitrary measures that seem to show an ignorance or wilful disregard of boy-nature, which in itself gives a partial explanation of the boys' unruliness. But, rough as public school life confessedly then was, it was not wanting in gentler elements. At Eton, a small editorial committee, of which John Hookham Frere was a member, produced, in 1786, *The Microcosm*, modelled on the periodical essays and miscellanies in which the time was prolific. The rival school, Westminster, had its *Trifler* in 1788, to which Robert Southey, then in the school, made a rejected contribution; his management of his own magazine, *The Flagellant*, led to his expulsion. Like most of their kind, of which they were the first, these school miscellanies were ephemeral.

Of the education of girls above the purely elementary stage, it is unnecessary to add to the account already given of its condition during the first half of the century<sup>1</sup>, except, perhaps, to say that its imperfections had become more obvious to contemporary critics, and that some steps had been taken to amend them, as Sir Anthony Absolute and Mrs Malaprop indirectly testify.

'We have *young ladies... boarded and educated*,' says Miss Alscrip (in Burgoyne's *The Heiress*, 1786), 'upon blue boards in gold letters in every village, with a strolling player for dancing master, and a deserter from Dunkirk to teach the French grammar.'

The mother-tongue and drawing were regarded as studies especially appropriate to girls, and by the end of the century botany had been placed in the same category. The opinion was fairly general that girls and young women of all but the highest social standing, or great wealth, ought to receive instruction of a distinctly 'useful' domestic kind, with small regard to its formative value<sup>2</sup>; the others were to acquire 'accomplishments' for the purpose of ornament and to occupy time which would otherwise certainly be spent in mischief. This ideal of the socially distinguished had great attraction for those who lacked both time and means to realise it in any appreciable degree, and the consequence was that, throughout the first half of the nineteenth century, the pursuit

<sup>1</sup> See, *ante*, vol. ix, pp. 401—4.

<sup>2</sup> Adam Smith unreservedly praises the current manner of educating girls on this very ground.

of 'accomplishments,' as such, reacted injuriously upon the instruction of girls and women generally. A work on education long very popular in France and England, *Adèle et Théodore* (1782), by Madame de Genlis, bluntly asserted that women 'are born to a life both monotonous and dependent.... In their case, genius is a useless and dangerous endowment, which takes them out of their natural state.' So long as this judgment reflected public opinion, a superficial education for girls was more than tolerated. Only a revolutionary like Mary Wollstonecraft could plead that sex alone should not determine the course of study, and that schoolboys and schoolgirls should be educated together.

The aims and methods of schools of good, but not of the first, standing, may be inferred from Knox's *Liberal Education*. The author, who was master of Tunbridge school from 1778 to 1812, and a very popular writer for some forty years, was always a staunch upholder of 'the established manner' in education. The basis of all sound instruction was to be found in Latin and Greek alone; but, when the foundation had been laid, it was desirable to include modern studies in the superstructure. The school was primarily concerned with the grammar of the two languages and the writing of verse and of prose in both; the list of authors to be read was but a short one. To these indispensable studies there might be added, as opportunity offered, the elements of geography and history, French, some mathematics and such accomplishments as music, drawing and fencing. These last received only a tepid encouragement from Knox, who was more warmly in favour of dancing and 'the learning of the military exercise, which is now very common.' Boys were expected to read English and easy Latin books in their leisure time; it was a general rule of practice with Knox that as much self-initiated effort as possible should be exacted from the pupil. He set his face against all such debilitating aids as translations, 'keys,' 'introductions' and the like.

That the established curriculum was not universally satisfactory is evident from the pains Knox took to show the inadequacy of the instruction given in many private schools, commonly termed 'academies,' which prepared boys for 'business' and 'the office.' Though these academies professed to teach many things, of which Latin or, more frequently, French was one, Knox asserted that their success was confined to reading, writing and summing. Forty years later he repeated this opinion; but the public demand in the interval had brought about a great increase

in the number and efficiency of schools of this kind, the monopoly of the grammar school and the severely classical course being seriously impaired in consequence.

Carlisle (*Endowed Grammar Schools*, 1818) records the foundation of twenty-eight schools between 1700 and 1798, of which only six belong to the later half of the period ; at least one-fourth of these twenty-eight schools, in spite of their name, confined their instruction to English reading, writing and summing. In one or two cases, the endowment was expressly said to be for the benefit of girls as well as boys. The charity schools, which, at the beginning of the century, had promised to develop into a widespread system of popular schools, ceased before the accession of George III to increase in number, and those that survived had outlived their usefulness. Sarah Trimmer (*Reflections upon... charity schools*, 1792), a critic not entirely unfriendly, describes them as teaching by rote religious formularies greatly beyond the capacity of children, while many of the teachers were incompetent to do better, and the whole plan of instruction was too sedentary.

The primary purpose of the Sunday schools started in 1780 by Thomas Stock, a Gloucester clergyman, and Robert Raikes, a newspaper proprietor of the same city, was the religious and moral instruction of the poor ; all these schools taught reading, some taught writing also and a few added to these arts simple arithmetic or 'accounts.' During the early nineteenth century, writers on public education invariably include Sunday schools and their very numerous pupils as part of the national equipment in education. These schools outdid the rapid success of the charity schools ; so early as 1784, Wesley reported that he found them springing up wherever he went. In the following year, their organisation was assured by the creation of the Sunday Schools' Union. The teachers were not all volunteers ; in some instances, where there were eighteen children in a school, the teacher was paid as many pence for his day's work, and a penny a day was deducted, or added, for each pupil less, or more, than the normal eighteen. This was done deliberately in order to induce teachers 'to be more careful about the attendance of the scholars'; it was one of two, or three, devices employed in the early Sunday schools which were adopted by the government in respect of elementary day-schools at a later time.

For those who could pay a few pence weekly, there were, by the close of the eighteenth century an unknown number of

privately conducted schools which taught reading, writing and summing, either in the evening or day-time; and many men and women followed the ancient practice of supplementing their domestic employment by teaching children. Mrs Trimmer and Joseph Lancaster (who began life as the master and proprietor of a school for the poor) both drew unfavourable pictures of the instruction given under these conditions; but their statements imply that the instruction itself was widely desired by the poor themselves and accessible even in villages<sup>1</sup>. For the benefit of an even humbler rank, 'schools of industry' gave instruction, for the most part to girls, in spinning, knitting and plain needlework, and to a smaller number of boys in weaving, gardening and minor handicrafts; in some cases, manual exercises were supplemented by the teaching of reading and writing. Mrs Trimmer and Hannah More were conspicuous in organising and conducting this voluntary extension of casual and strictly local efforts, sometimes supported from the parish rates, which, from the sixteenth century onwards, had been made on behalf of pauper children<sup>2</sup>. The inception of the 'school of industry' seems to have been due to a most retiring, public-spirited woman, Mrs E. Denward, of Hardres court, Canterbury, who, about the year 1786, induced Mrs Trimmer to put the idea of such a school into practice. In method and intention, these English schools may be compared with the experiment in educating the very poor which Pestalozzi began at Neuhof some twelve years earlier.

The disproportionate attention accorded to some features of Chesterfield's *Letters to his Son*<sup>3</sup> has deprived their author of his undoubted right to be ranked among the educational reformers of his time. He illustrates very fully the aristocratic prejudice against schools and universities in favour of the courtly training given by private tutors and foreign academies. But, in this respect, he is a survival from an earlier generation; boys of Chesterfield's rank who were intended, like his son, to pursue a public career swelled the revived prosperity of Eton and built up the fortunes of Harrow, in the generation which immediately followed. As an educator, Chesterfield is most emphatically a humanist. The fundamental study recommended to his son is that of his fellow-men, particularly as they exist in courts and

<sup>1</sup> See, especially, Trimmer, S., *The Oeconomy of Charity* (1801), pp. 182—3, Lancaster, J., *Improvements in Education* (1803), pp. 1—21.

<sup>2</sup> See, *ante*, vol. ix, pp. 405—6.

<sup>3</sup> See, *ante*, vol. x, chap. xi.

capital cities; protracted residence abroad, and the knowledge of languages and literatures are merely auxiliary to this study, or to rhetoric, the instrument by which men are to be persuaded or cajoled. But the humanism of Chesterfield is chiefly concerned with the humanity of his own day, with its purposes and institutions of all kinds. It is this which causes him to anticipate the changes which were completed in French and German schools before the century ended. He craves 'a pretty large circle of knowledge,' which shall include not only Latin and Greek, but, also, the spoken tongues and some of the classical books of England, France, Italy and Germany, modern history and geography, jurisprudence, with a knowledge of logic, mathematics and experimental science. Much of this learning is to be acquired through intercourse rather than through books; manners, which are of the first importance, can only be learned in the same school, with assistance from those exercises of the academy which train the body to health and grace. Much of this 'large circle' is avowedly superficial. Chesterfield feels no scruple on that account, if only his pupil can command the power of the orator to influence men<sup>1</sup>. From the outset of the *Letters*, the study of rhetoric is insisted upon; style is wellnigh everything, matter is of less importance. The *Letters* to A. C. Stanhope (which are more instructive and much more entertaining than those to Stanhope's son, Chesterfield's successor in the title) drop this insistence upon the cultivation of oratory; but the character of the up-bringing there recommended is much the same as that prescribed in the earlier series of letters.

Lord Kames's *Loose Hints upon Education* (1781) perfectly justifies its title. Its main topic is 'the culture of the heart,' a topic characteristic of its time, treated according to 'the system of nature.' But, in spite of the author's admiration of *Émile*, this does not mean the system of Rousseau, for its corner-stone is parental authority, and Rousseau's proposal to employ natural consequences as a moral discipline is dismissed as 'smoke.'

The eighteenth century exhibits no more sincere exponents of Locke's educational ideas than the Edgeworths of Edgeworthstown, who, for three generations, laboured persistently to apply

<sup>1</sup> Sheridan, Thos., *British Education* (1756), p. xiii, refers to Chesterfield's unrealised proposal, made while lord lieutenant of Ireland (1745—6) 'to the provost and fellows of the university for the endowment of proper lectures and exercises in the art of reading and speaking English.'

those ideas to practice within the limits of a large family. The literary monuments of their activity are the work of Richard Lovell Edgeworth and his daughter, Maria<sup>1</sup>; but the initial movements were due to Richard's mother, Jane (Lovell).

She had read everything that had been written on the subject of education and preferred with sound judgment the opinions of Locke; to these, with modifications suggested by her own good sense, she steadily adhered<sup>2</sup>.

Edgeworth's own education, obtained partly in Ireland, partly in England, was very desultory; but its most effective elements owed very much more to his temperament, genius and casual opportunities than to school or university. He married the first of his four wives before he was one-and-twenty; his first child was born two years after the publication (1762) of Rousseau's *Émile*. Between the ages of three and eight, this son was brought up on Rousseau's 'system,' with results which did not entirely satisfy the father, whose subsequent experience taught him to recognise the fundamental weaknesses of Rousseau as a guide to conduct and learning. It was at this time that Edgeworth's college friend, Thomas Day (in later years author of *Sandford and Merton*) was superintending, at the age of twenty-one, the education of two orphan girls with the purpose of marrying one of them, leaving the result to decide which; he married neither. The express function of domestic educator which Edgeworth assumed from the beginning of his married life he continued so long as he lived: his last marriage was contracted at the age of fifty-four, and the number of his children was eighteen. His daughter, Maria, described him as a teacher at once patient, candid and stimulating, with a sympathetic understanding of his children and skill in adapting instruction to their individual needs: qualities hardly to be expected from his keen, vivacious temperament. But his interest in education was by no means confined to the family circle. He read widely on the subject, and, in his later years, paid special attention to the educational institutions of France; at Paris, in 1803, he met 'a German, Pestalozzi... much celebrated on the Continent,' who 'made anatomy a principal object in his system of education'—one more illustration of Pestalozzi's difficulty in making his ideas understood. Edgeworth proposed (1809) a scheme of 'secondary' schools (the word is his) to be established throughout the country under the management of a private association; the proposal, no doubt, was suggested by a similar but much more extensive plan for popular instruction described

<sup>1</sup> See, *ante*, vol. xi, chap. xiii.

<sup>2</sup> Edgeworth, R. L., *Memoirs*, p. 66.

in Joseph Lancaster's *Improvements in Education* (1803). One of the latest measures of the Irish parliament before the Union was a bill for the improvement of Irish education introduced by Edgeworth, who became an active member of the royal commission which subsequently enquired into the state of Irish education (1806—12).

Edgeworth's second wife, Honora Sneyd (who was married in 1773 and died in 1780) would seem to have determined the main lines upon which the Edgeworth theory of education was shaped. She and her husband wrote for their children a small book, *Harry and Lucy* (1778), which, undertaken as a supplement to Mrs Barbauld's writings, itself became the originator of *Sandford and Merton*<sup>1</sup>, the work of their friend, Day, begun with the intention of assisting their scheme of domestic instruction. Honora Edgeworth 'was of opinion that the art of education should be considered as an experimental science' and, to give effect to that opinion, in 1776 began to keep a register of observations concerning children, upon which her husband was still engaged nearly twenty years after her death. That record guided Maria Edgeworth in writing the collection of tales for children which she called *The Parent's Assistant* (1796); it formed the basis of fact beneath the theory applied in *Practical Education* (1798), the joint work of herself and her father and the most considerable book on its subject produced in England between John Locke and Herbert Spencer.

*Practical Education* derives its essential principles from Locke and from the experiential psychology expounded by Hartley and Reid; Rousseau's *Émile* is used with discrimination. It attaches the highest importance to the training of character and to the cultivation of the understanding; to effect the latter, the educator must persistently suggest to the pupil motives for acquiring knowledge. The leading theme is, of course, domestic education; in relation to the education given at a public school (which is regarded as almost exclusively a place of instruction in the two classical languages) the indispensable business of the home is to lay a firm foundation of habit and moral principles, without which the subsequent schooling is in danger of proving mischievous. True to its origin, the book makes utility the arbiter in the choice of studies and strongly urges the claims of hand-work and of

<sup>1</sup> See, *ante*, vol. xi, p. 382. The quasi-narrative form, by which Rousseau's *Émile* (1762) tried to soften the asperities of educational theory, had many popular imitators, French and English.

positive knowledge, particularly that of natural phenomena, to inclusion in the curriculum. The reiterated recommendation of play and of spontaneous activity in general as agents of instruction is an anticipation of Froebel, without a trace of the German's mysticism. Edgeworth's own tastes and inventive skill were naturally imitated by some of his children, and his sympathetic knowledge of the experimental science taught by Franklin and Priestley inevitably brought similar studies into the domestic school-room. Notwithstanding these marks of the innovator, Edgeworth is no revolutionary in reference to the long-established rhetorical instruction of the schools. He regards as very necessary the writing and, above all, the public speaking of good English, the practice of which he would make habitual from childhood. In *Professional Education* (1809), he lays it down that the making of verses is waste of time and the writing of Latin prose is not necessary for any but the professed Latinist; yet, he considers 'a knowledge and a taste for classical literature' 'indispensably necessary to every Briton who aspires to distinction in public life, for in this country a statesman must be an orator.' As evidence of the care bestowed by Edgeworth on teaching the rudiments of English to children, it may be noted that he devised (and published in *A Rational Primer*) a set of diacritical marks which virtually make our alphabet phonetic; his ideas concerning the teaching of grammar, vernacular or foreign, and his sense of the importance of modern languages bring him abreast of the best modern practice. Yet, he and his daughter shared a common prejudice of their time against fairy-tales for children. Maria's stories in *The Parent's Assistant* were written as substitutes for those classics of the nursery, which father and daughter thought 'are not now much read'—a dismal judgment which was confirmed by Wordsworth in *The Prelude*<sup>1</sup>.

*Professional Education* is the work of Edgeworth alone. Its title notwithstanding, it has very little to say respecting purely technical instruction, whether clerical, military, medical or legal. The main theme is the nature of the general, preparatory instruction which a boy should receive with a view to his life's work: a purpose which, in the author's opinion, universities and public schools ignored. The plan of the book appropriately includes a consideration of the education proper to the professions of country gentleman, statesman, prince. If the book were written today, its title would probably be 'Vocational Education.' Sydney Smith

<sup>1</sup> See, *ante*, vol. XI, chap. XVI.



made it the occasion of an *Edinburgh* review (1809), in which he condemned the excessive amount of time devoted in English education to Latin and Greek and more particularly to Latin verse-making, with a consequent impoverishment of knowledge amongst Englishmen in general.

Edgeworth represents the best of the many system-makers who tried to give effect to the principles of *Émile*. Wordsworth, although as ready as Rousseau to rely upon liberty and childish instinct as guideposts for the educator, poured scorn upon system-mongers and their product, 'the model child,' a prodigy of useful information, precocious criticism and self-conceit. *The Prelude* relates the course of the poet's own upbringing at school (1778—86) and at Cambridge (1787—91), and parenthetically shows how he himself would educate 'according to Nature'; but he is, perhaps, too prone to see the general in the particular, and, consequently, to overlook the powers and the needs of commonplace boys and men. A different note is struck in *The Excursion* (1814), the eighth and ninth books of which expose the essential evils of the industrial revolution, and express the poet's confident belief that a national scheme of education following the proposals of Andrew Bell could yet overcome them. Thirty years later, he recorded his sorrow that no such plan had been put into operation.

Maria Edgeworth's earliest book, *Letters for Literary Ladies* (1795), presents the then customary arguments on female disability as conceived by the complacent male, who is allowed, on the whole, to get the better of the dispute; incidental reference is made to the increasing attention then being paid to the education of girls. The modern touch is not wanting; a good cook, we are told, is only an empirical chemist.

A quite unmerited neglect has fallen upon the educational writings of the Edgeworths, who taught principles which have since been accepted as revelations, when presented by a German or an Italian author. This is the more to be regretted, since these two Irish writers were capable of wisdom so unusual as the following:

In education, we must, however, consider the actual state of manners in that world in which our pupils are to live, as well as our wishes or our hopes of its gradual improvement.

Joseph Priestley's *Miscellaneous Observations relating to Education* (1778) contains an anticipation of the first chapter of Herbert Spencer's *Education* so close in thought and phrase

as to suggest Spencer's familiarity with the book. The theme is education as preparatory to 'subsistence,' and the study of natural science is the means proposed. Priestley urges a claim for a type of instruction suitable to those whose destination is neither the university nor the counting-house. Like many of his contemporaries, he believed that, if the customary curriculum was to escape general repudiation, useful knowledge must be included in it; but he was even more anxious to base a liberal education upon a course of modern studies.

No subject had greater interest for the reformers than the mother-tongue, whose educational value had been persistently asserted in England for more than a century past. But, while its indispensable place in a satisfactory curriculum might be granted, considerable doubt existed as to the best manner of teaching the vernacular, when admitted. Locke (*Some Thoughts concerning Education*) had formulated an excellent method of rudimentary instruction in English; but the difficulty of systematising the language for the purpose of tuition had not disappeared. The fluctuation of spelling and of idiom, and the absence of any generally accepted manual of grammar, were the points to which reformers addressed themselves. Swift (*A Letter to the Lord High Treasurer*)<sup>1</sup> had expressed the belief that it was desirable and possible to 'ascertain,' and then 'fix' the language for ever, the standard being sought in the English of Elizabeth, James and Charles; his pamphlet long survived in the memory of would-be innovators though the standard itself was shifted. A serious attempt to grapple with the asserted instability of the mother-tongue may be dated from the publication of Johnson's *Dictionary* (1755)<sup>2</sup>, which was followed by other works intended to attain similar ends. Joseph Priestley's *Rudiments of English Grammar* (1761), originally intended as a school-book, is marked by a common-sense parsimony of technical terms very unusual in writers on the subject, and by a deference to customary usage which would shock the pedant. Robert Lowth, in his anonymously published *A Short Introduction to English Grammar* (1762), asserted that the ungrammatical English of 'polite' conversation, and of such of 'our most approved authors' as Dryden, Addison, Pope and Swift himself, was due to sheer carelessness and not to any inherent defect in the language. The method of Lowth's book

<sup>1</sup> 'A proposal for correcting, improving and ascertaining the English Tongue in a letter to the . . . Earl of Oxford' (1712).

<sup>2</sup> See, *ante*, vol. x, pp. 173 ff.

was adopted and its terminology further elaborated in the *English Grammar* (1795) of Lindley Murray, who may be regarded as the originator of that formal, logic-chopping treatment of its subject which long made English grammar the least profitable of school studies. This celebrated text-book had no claim to novelty beyond a careful selection of what was thought most useful, and its presentation in different sizes of printer's types in order to indicate degrees of importance. Its success was immediate and extraordinary. In the year of its author's death (1826), it had reached its fortieth edition, and, in spite of abridgments in many editions and innumerable imitations in Great Britain and America, it was still being printed in 1877. Its immediate success testifies to the great and increasing number of schools, chiefly private boarding schools, which, at the opening of the nineteenth century, made an 'English education' their avowed aim.

Thomas Sheridan, godson of Swift and father of Richard Brinsley Sheridan, published, in 1756, *British Education*, a tiresome, long-winded work, stuffed with quotations chiefly from Locke and Milton, in which he called for the standardising of English spelling, pronunciation, diction and idiom, and advocated the study of English rhetoric, the encouragement of public speaking and of the art of reading. He appeared to believe that due attention to these matters would effect the political, religious, moral and aesthetic redemption of society. Yet, in spite of his sympathy with the chief aim of the Académie Française, he would not secure these advantages by means of any academy or society, but trusted to the introduction of rhetoric and elocution into the ordinary school and college course, and, thereafter, to the critical discussion which that introduction would bring about. Sheridan proposed to give effect to his ideas by establishing a school for the post-collegiate instruction of the well-to-do on lines which, today, would be termed 'vocational'; that is, the studies pursued were to bear directly upon the future occupation of the pupil. In proposing provision upon liberal lines for the education of the future legislator, country gentleman, soldier and merchant, Sheridan was continuing the tradition of that 'doctrine of courtesy' which had added a multitude of books to European languages during some two-and-a-half centuries; and these works had always upheld the claims of vernacular languages in schemes of education. A body of very influential persons founded the Hibernian society at Dublin in 1758 with the intention of carrying out Sheridan's plan; but the project was attacked by private schoolmasters as a mere pretext

for bestowing a salaried office upon its originator. Incidentally, these attacks show that there was a great deal of professional as well as public sympathy with the advocates of a modern curriculum, and some success in employing it where schools were unfettered by ancient statute. One of the assailants, the anonymous writer of *A letter to a schoolmaster in the country* (1758), wields an ironic pen reminiscent of Swift; he doubts the feasibility of giving to those who have passed through the established course of education

the air and turn of the high-rank people, as they want for a ground work the inanity of thought and unconnected succession of ideas which make the specific difference between a gentleman and a pedant.

The scheme for a school or college propounded to the Hibernian society in 1758, and similar schemes of 1769 and 1783—4, came to nothing; but Sheridan, till the last, continued to plead for the study of rhetoric and the practice of elocution. He was one of the earliest students of English prosody<sup>1</sup>, phonetics and spelling-reform; by insisting that language is primarily and essentially a thing spoken, not written, he anticipated the principle underlying recent changes in language-teaching.

The beginning of 'the Scottish school of rhetoric' was almost contemporary with the labours of Sheridan and Priestley. The earliest utterances of this school are to be found in the *Essays* (1742 and 1758) of David Hume, but its earliest separate publication was *Elements of Rhetoric* (1762) by Henry Home, lord Kames. From 1759 onwards, Hugh Blair lectured on 'composition' in Edinburgh with such success that a chair of rhetoric and *belles lettres* was founded for him there in 1762. The professorial discourses delivered during his occupancy of this chair were published in the year of his retirement as *Lectures on Rhetoric and Belles Lettres* (1783). The mark of this Scottish school is the attempt, not uniformly successful, to elaborate from the associational psychology<sup>2</sup> of the time a doctrine of taste and rules for its expression in the arts, particularly in the art of composition. The psychology and the rules and doctrine professedly deduced from it wear a detached air in the writings of Blair and Kames; in spite of their repudiation of great names and their desire to build empirically, none of the school shakes himself quite free from Aristotle and the great literary critics. But they did good service in a period greatly inclined to an exclusive rationalism

<sup>1</sup> See, *ante*, vol. xi, pp. 250, 255.

<sup>2</sup> See, *ante*, vol. x, p. 342.

by asserting the fundamental nature of emotion and its necessary part in the production and enjoyment of all forms of art; their pupils were prepared to welcome wholeheartedly the literary principles of Wordsworth, Byron and Scott. George Campbell's *The Philosophy of Rhetoric*, begun in 1750 and published in 1776, succeeds best in presenting its theme systematically and without much embarrassment from its psychological groundwork; Campbell remains to this day a helpful critic of diction, though he is sometimes meticulous in cases where his own sound criterion of 'reputable use' is against him. Blair's three-volume *Lectures* is a magazine for reference rather than an ordered system of instruction; as tutorial work to be used in large classes, the lectures may have proved interesting and useful to attentive students, but, as a book, they are very tedious. The third volume presents in germ the general idea of literature distinguishable from its various national varieties. A secondary feature in the teaching of the Scottish school is the great importance which it attributed to the arts of public reading and speaking. In the distinct course of study proposed by Knox (*Liberal Education*, 1781), he included these accomplishments, on the ground that English ought to form a great part of an English gentleman's education. Enfield's *The Speaker* (1774) quickly established itself in common use and long retained its vogue as an authoritative anthology of 'recitations' from Shakespeare, Sterne, Pope and more modern writers; its author, who was a tutor at the Warrington academy after Priestley's time, expressly intended his book to be associated with the Scottish teaching of rhetoric. Its early success points to a considerable number of schools and schoolmasters in sympathy with some recognition of the vernacular as an educational instrument.

The psychology of Locke and its educational corollaries<sup>1</sup> were fully appreciated and further developed in France, where, by 1793, they became co-ordinated in the demand for a state-maintained system of schools, primary and secondary, with additional provision for higher and professional education, the primary stage of this system at least being gratuitous and universally obligatory. In England, the desire to see a great increase in the means of popular instruction of some sort was fairly general amongst thinking men; but there was much hesitation in determining the part to be played by the state itself in the matter. As early as 1756, Thomas Sheridan in *British Education*

<sup>1</sup> See, *ante*, vol. ix, p. 401.

had asserted that 'in every State it should be a fundamental maxim that the education of youth should be particularly formed and adapted to the nature and end of its government'—a principle which John Brown made more explicit by a proposal for universal instruction imposed by law with a view to instilling 'the manners and principles on which alone the State can rest<sup>1</sup>.' The last word is significant; for Brown and Sheridan alike, the state was an entity to which change could only be fatal. The danger attending that opinion was exposed by Joseph Priestley (*An essay on the first principles of government*, 1768), who reminded Brown and other admirers of Spartan officialism that 'uniformity is the characteristic of the brute creation.'

Education is a branch of civil liberty which ought by no means to be surrendered into the hands of a civil magistrate, and the best interests of society require that the right of conducting it be inviolably preserved to individuals.

The prominent position as public teacher, educational reformer, man of science and political thinker to which Priestley attained in later years gave an authority to this opinion which more than counterbalanced the rambling diffuseness of Sheridan and the industrious pamphleteering of Brown. It became an accepted article of the radical creed that, in the interest of liberty, the state's intervention in public education should be reduced as much as possible; in consequence, the history of English educational administration between 1790 and 1870 marks a very slow movement from private, cooperative activity to public control grudgingly admitted. In her own day, Mary Wollstonecraft (*A Vindication of the Rights of Woman*, 1792) stood almost alone in her readiness to accept the French conception in full. The prevalent opinion was better expressed by William Godwin (*Enquiry concerning political justice*, etc., 1796): 'the project of national education ought uniformly to be discouraged on account of its obvious alliance with national government.' But Godwin's doctrine, as expressed in this work, is the negation of all social cooperation; and the desire to extend instruction to the great bulk of the people, when confronted with the problem of its cost, in the end compelled the unwilling to accept state support. For two centuries before the appearance of *The Wealth of Nations* (1776), Scotsmen had been familiar with the idea of public education supported by public funds, and, since 1696, they had been putting the idea into practice. It is, therefore, not

<sup>1</sup> *Thoughts on Civil Liberty* (1765), p. 591.

surprising to discover Adam Smith laying it down that a man uneducated is a man mutilated and that, since an ignorant person is an element of weakness in the community, public education is a mode of national defence. Nevertheless, he thinks that the state's part should be limited to making elementary instruction compulsory and to supplying the money required to meet any deficiency in voluntary contributions; the absence of competition, from which public and endowed institutions like universities and grammar schools suffer, leads unavoidably to inefficiency and neglect. Instruction should be almost self-supporting. Still, the state might impose an examination-test 'even in the higher and more difficult sciences' upon all candidates for professional employment, and an examination in reading, writing and reckoning should be passed before a man could become a freeman, or set up a trade in a corporate town or village. Thomas Paine (*The Rights of Man*, 1791) believed that 'a nation under a well-regulated government should permit none to remain uninstructed'; but he would not have the state establish or directly maintain schools. Paine endeavoured to make these opinions harmonise by suggesting that grants, or remission of taxes, should be allowed in respect of individual children, on condition that the parents made a payment for their instruction. Like Adam Smith, he saw no difficulty in finding teachers: 'there are always persons of both sexes to be found in every village, especially when growing into years, capable of such an undertaking.' Events proved that the magnitude of the task was vastly underrated.

The subject passed beyond the range of merely academic discussion on the appearance of Joseph Lancaster's *Improvements in Education* (1803). Apart from its account of the author's mode of organising a school, 'the monitorial or mutual system,' a device for which he was greatly indebted to Andrew Bell<sup>1</sup>, the chief merit of this pamphlet lies in its scheme for making elementary instruction general. Lancaster believed that the matter was one of 'national concern,' which sectarianism alone had hindered from coming by its own; but he was equally against the enactment of a 'compulsive law,' applied either to school-children or their teachers. He proposed the establishment of a voluntary society 'on general Christian principles' (that is, destitute of denominational associations), having as its objects 'the promotion of good morals and the instruction of youth in useful learning adapted to their respective situations.' These

<sup>1</sup> *Experiments in Education* (1798, 2nd edn, 1805).

objects were to be attained by the bestowal of the society's patronage upon masters and mistresses already at work in their own schools who proved worthy of encouragement, by offering prizes to school-children for regular and punctual attendance, by establishing schools (this was inserted with some hesitation), by setting up a public library containing books on education for the information of teachers, by enabling teachers to obtain school material at cost price and by instituting a teachers' friendly society. Lancaster assumed that the aims of his proposed association could be achieved 'in some hundreds of schools amongst many thousands of children at an expence that probably would not exceed £1500 *per annum*.'

Lancaster's suggestion that his proposed society should rest upon an undenominational basis roused the opposition of Sarah Trimmer, who had become obsessed by the notion that a conspiracy against Christianity, originally contrived, as she conceived, by the French Encyclopedists, was threatening these islands. To defeat this plot, she had established *The Guardian of Education* (1802—6), a magazine full of orthodox prejudice which is of importance to the bibliographer of education, though the book-notices of which it chiefly consists possess few other merits. Lancaster's *Improvements* was thought to deserve not only an elaborate review in this periodical, but, also, a counterblast in the form of a bulky pamphlet, *A comparative view of the New Plan of Education promulgated by Mr Joseph Lancaster* (1805). Mrs Trimmer agreed that 'an interference of the Legislature in respect to the education of the common people' was 'highly necessary.' But she declared that a national system already existed, and she entirely disapproved of societies founded on so indefinite a conception as 'general Christian principles.' Instead of adopting this conception (the appearance of which in the field of education she rightly traced to the German apostle of natural religion, J. B. Basedow (1724—90)), she would, with Priestley, leave each religious body free to instruct its children in accordance with its own tenets. The church of England was the established church, and the acts of Uniformity prescribed the study of the church catechism and the use of the Book of Common Prayer; these, therefore, constituted a national system of education, with the charity schools and grammar schools as its agents, and with the bishops in the exercise of functions that had belonged to them from time immemorial as its chief authorities. Yet Lancaster desired to replace this legally constituted system by an innovation which, notwithstanding its merit as a chief and



feasible mode of organising popular schools, was ill-grounded and mischievous. John Bowles (*Letter to Whitbread*, 1807) put Mrs Trimmer's point of view succinctly: 'when education is made a national concern, youth must be brought up as members of the national church.'

The main issue thus raised took the discussion at once into the wider arena of political questions, where it secured considerable attention. Lancaster's 'undenominational' system was regarded by Tories and churchmen as a deliberate attack upon the establishment; Whigs and dissenters cherished it as a guarantee of religious liberty. The essential weakness of the method of instruction advocated by Bell and Lancaster, in which pupils were entirely taught by fellow-pupils, was forgotten by the critics in their anxiety to deal with an accident of 'the Mutual System,' namely, the character of the religious instruction to be imparted. Wordsworth (*The Prelude*, 1799—1805) and Coleridge (*Biographia Literaria*, 1815—17) had ridiculed methodisers and mechanical forms of teaching; but both were warm adherents of Bell. Pamphlets, reviews and sermons urged the respective merits of the 'Madras' and 'Lancasterian' 'systems,' or the claim of their respective authors to rank as 'discoverers.' Sydney Smith, Robert Owen, Henry Brougham, William Wilberforce, Romilly, Samuel Rogers and James Mill were sympathisers with, or active supporters of, Lancaster. Southey, in a *Quarterly Review* article (October 1811), vindicated against *The Edinburgh Review* (November 1810) Bell's right to be considered Lancaster's forerunner, and exposed the evils and absurdities which he held to mark Lancaster's mode of school management. The climax of the dispute was reached in a sermon preached at St Paul's in June 1811 by the Cambridge lady Margaret professor, Herbert Marsh, in which he repeated Mrs Trimmer's arguments on national education, the church and undenominationalism. The sermon was followed immediately by the formation of a committee whose labours took effect, in October 1811, in the institution of 'the National Society for promoting the education of the Poor in the principles of the Established Church.' The rival organisation was 'the British and Foreign School Society' (1814), the successor of the Royal Lancasterian Institute and Lancaster's committee founded in 1808. Thus, 'the voluntary system' of English elementary schools was begun, and a compromise between state interference and individualism was effected, which lasted till 1870. The desire, fervently expressed in *The Excursion*, for a state-controlled education based on the Madras

system was not realised; although many Englishmen were willing to extend a modicum of instruction to the poor as an act of grace, very few agreed with Wordsworth, Pestalozzi and Kant in regarding education as 'a sacred right' inherent in human nature.

The faults of the mutual or monitorial system are obvious; yet, contemporary opinion ranked it as a great discovery or invention, a nostrum for all the ills of education. Bell honestly believed that he was introducing no mere expedient for making a minimum of mechanical instruction accessible to large numbers, but a true educational *organon* capable of changing the whole aspect of society and applicable to all grades of instruction. Lancaster's claims were not a whit more restricted. Mutual instruction was introduced into Charterhouse (1813), where it survived in favour for at least five years; a few grammar schools and some private boarding schools followed the example. Families of wealth and position in London combined to form their own little Madras school, with 'a most charming monitor boy' from the Central school in Baldwin's Gardens to act as master. Pillans employed the plan in the High School of Edinburgh. Measures were taken to make the system known on the continent, particularly in France; and it attained a new distinction from the genius and devotion which father Girard displayed in the elementary schools of Fribourg. Jeremy Bentham (*Chrestomathia*, 1816) identified himself with an abortive scheme for founding 'The Chrestomathic [*i.e.* Useful Knowledge] Day school,' to teach a thousand boys and girls the circle of the sciences on the lines of 'the New Instruction System.'

At first, the National and British societies had no association with the state; but their contributions to national education were so many and so important that when, in 1833, parliament agreed to an annual grant of £20,000 'to be issued in aid of private subscriptions for the erection of school houses for the education of the children of the poorer classes in Great Britain,' the money was handed to the societies for allocation, on condition that at least an equal sum was privately subscribed.

The earliest attempts of Robert Owen to revolutionise society were made by way of the school. When, in 1799, he took over the New Lanark mills from David Dale, he found a plan of instruction in operation for mill-children, which had but small success, owing to the fact that it was conducted in the evening at the termination of a long day's work. By gradual elaboration, carried out between 1799 and 1816, this instruction was expanded into the New Institution for the Formation of Character, which, in its full form,

included an adult evening-school, a day-school for children whose ages ranged from six to ten and an infant-school for little ones of a year old and upwards. It was an axiom of Owen that character is formed from without, not attained from within, that 'circumstances' are all-powerful in the process of its formation. The basal principles of the New Institution were that a child's mind is absolutely plastic and that human nature is innately good, two characteristic eighteenth century beliefs derived from Locke and Rousseau. The instruction given in the two schools was presented conversationally and intuitively: that is, knowledge of things was communicated not through books, but by means of the things themselves, or representations of them other than verbal. It was impressed upon each child that he 'must endeavour to make his companions happy.' The teaching included reading, writing, summing, the Bible and the Shorter catechism, history, geography, music, dancing and 'the military discipline' for both sexes. Owen claimed that his schools made children both rational and altruistic; the fame of New Lanark was widespread, and visitors, many of them distinguished, came in large numbers to inspect the social life of the place, and of its children more especially. But, by his attacks on all particular forms of religion, Owen shocked the majority of his partners in business, and, in 1824, these succeeded in destroying the peculiar character of the New Institution by bringing it within the system of the British and Foreign School society. The New Lanark experiment played a considerable part in demonstrating the value and feasibility of popular schools at a time when the subject was prominent in the public mind; its more precise result was the institution of infant-schools, whose extension throughout England was primarily due to the Infant School society (founded in 1824) and to the labours of its superintendent, Samuel Wilderspin.

The establishment of *The Edinburgh Review*<sup>1</sup>, in 1802, brought Scottish and English education into a new and unanticipated relationship. During its early days (1807—11), the reviewers, more especially Sydney Smith and Henry Brougham, developed a policy of hostile criticism, of which English educational institutions were the object. The monopoly conferred upon Greek and Latin by grammar schools and universities, the consequent indifference to the claims of 'useful knowledge,' the futility of current modes of educating girls, were all unsparingly denounced; Lancaster was supported as a genuine apostle of popular

<sup>1</sup> See, *ante*, vol. XII, chap. VI.

instruction, while his orthodox rivals were ridiculed. Brougham's own education was chiefly Scottish; the studies in mathematics, physics and chemistry which, while an Edinburgh undergraduate, he had followed under such distinguished *savants* and teachers as John Playfair and Joseph Black, left an indelible impression upon his sympathies and mode of thought. He was a great admirer of the Scots parish school, that unbroken channel between the veriest rudiments and the classes of 'the college.' As member of parliament, he was associated with Samuel Whitbread and others belonging to the active group which advocated popular instruction and the monitorial system. After Whitbread's death, Brougham became the parliamentary leader of this group, and, in 1816, he secured the appointment of a select committee to enquire into the education of the lower orders of the metropolis. This committee extended its enquiries to schools outside London and to schools not usually regarded as coming within the terms of their reference. The administration of educational endowments in general was impeached by the committee's report of 1818, and by Brougham's *Letter to Samuel Romilly... upon the abuse of charities* (1818), a pamphlet which ran through ten editions within a few months. The committee's enquiry was prejudiced in origin, its chairman, Brougham, was dictatorial and its report menaced innocent as well as guilty; its inaccuracy was proved in particular cases like Winchester and Croydon<sup>1</sup>. Yet, the abuses denounced were notorious. Masters who had few or no free pupils, or no pupils at all, were endowed with schoolhouses and incomes; in some places, where the demand for grammar schools had died out, trustees were, in effect, misappropriating the endowments for their own benefit. Brougham and his friends were mistaken when they interpreted the phrase *pauperes et indigentes*, describing the beneficiaries of educational endowments, as though it were used in the sense conveyed by the English term 'indigent poor'; but there was reason in their contention that those endowments were not doing all that was possible for national education. A blind alley seemed to have been reached by Eldon's ruling in the chancery court (1805; reaffirmed some twenty years later), that grammar schools must employ trust funds for the teaching of Latin, Greek and Hebrew alone; to draw upon them for instruction in French, German or other modern studies would be misappropriation. But, in spite of chancery and their own statutes, a good many

<sup>1</sup> Bowles, W. L., *Vindiciae Wykehamicae*; dean Ireland, *Letter to Henry Brougham* (1819).

grammar schools, perhaps one-fourth of the total number, were being conducted as elementary or 'commercial' schools<sup>1</sup>.

The situation, as Brougham conceived it, was that property of great value had been devised for the education of the indigent poor, but that the bequest was useless because instruction was confined to three ancient languages. The parliamentary remedy seemed plain; he brought in two bills, the first (1818) to direct a comprehensive survey of all educational charities, the second (1820) to apply the parish school system of Scotland to her southern sister. By the latter bill, it was proposed to empower grammar schools to teach reading, writing and arithmetic as well as the statutory classical tongues; elementary schools were to be built at the national expense in every parish, whose householders were to pay the schoolmaster's salary. This second bill was defeated by the dissenters, who regarded it as a measure for increasing the authority and powers of bishops and parish clergy. The bill of 1818 passed into law, but lord Liverpool's government emasculated it by confining its sphere to charities unquestionably intended to act as poor-relief. So late as 1835, lord Brougham was still advocating the principles of 1818 and 1820; but, by that time, he had satisfied himself that the 'voluntary system' was competent to satisfy the claims of national education.

The rapid increase in number, throughout Great Britain, of Mechanics' institutions confirms the statement of contemporary observers that there was a widespread desire among urban populations for instruction. They owed their beginning to an associate of the first *Edinburgh* reviewers, George Birkbeck, a fellow-student and lifelong friend of Brougham. Birkbeck, who was professor of natural philosophy at the Andersonian institution, Glasgow, from 1799 to 1804, opened, in 1800, a free course of Saturday evening lectures to artisans, intended to familiarise them with some of the scientific principles underlying the employment of tools and machinery. The class met with immediate success and survived its originator's removal to London. Under his successor, it experienced a variety of fortunes, till, in 1823, a number of seceding members established the Glasgow Mechanics' institution and made Birkbeck its president. In the meantime, he was practising medicine in London, where he had become a member of the circle which included George Grote, Jeremy Bentham, James Mill, Joseph Hume, David Ricardo, John Cam Hobhouse, Sir Francis

<sup>1</sup> See *A letter to Henry Brougham...from an M.A. of Queen's College, Oxford, upon the best method of restoring decayed grammar schools* (1818).

Burdett, Francis Place, Brougham and others whose political principles ranged them with the philosophical radicals. A suggestion made in 1823 by *The Mechanics' Magazine*, that the Glasgow example should be followed in London, was eagerly taken up by Birkbeck and his friends; the result was the creation of the London Mechanics' institution (better known today as Birkbeck college), the development of which became the lifelong pre-occupation of the man whose name it now bears. Thirteen hundred members registered themselves at the outset; the course of study was chiefly scientific and practical, though it found room, also, for 'French, stenography, botany, mnemonics and phrenology.'

Brougham, with Birkbeck, one of the four original trustees of the new institution, greatly strengthened the educational policy of the group to which he and his friend belonged, by the publication, in 1825, of *Practical Observations upon the education of the people addressed to the working classes and their employers*, a pamphlet which gained as much attention as had been accorded to his *Letter to Romilly*. Here, in brief compass, the whole scheme for adult education was described. Two main lines of activity were proposed. Lectures to artisans, libraries, book clubs and 'conversation societies,' that is, tutorial classes, constituted the first; the encouragement of cheap publications and the preparation of elementary treatises on mathematics, physics and other branches of science formed the second. It was Brougham's opinion that the business of controlling Mechanics' institutions was a valuable element in the education of their members, and that the institutions themselves, once started, should and could be self-supporting. He probably overrated, in both respects, the ability of the working men of the time, as he certainly overrated the value of public lectures to persons whose preliminary instruction and training were slender. For a score of years after the foundation of the earliest of them, Mechanics' institutions increased in number and in extension over England and Scotland; but, at an early stage in their history, they ceased to be recruited in greater part from among artisans. It was this failure, added to the defective conception of education encouraged by Mechanics' institutions, which led Frederick Denison Maurice, F. J. Furnivall, Thomas Hughes, J. M. Ludlow, Charles Kingsley, John Ruskin and others to form, or support, the Working Men's college (1854), the word 'college' emphasising the close relationship between all who shared its life, either as teachers or pupils. The object of the

college was to place a liberal education within the reach of working men by providing instruction in those subjects which it most concerns English citizens to know. The absence of a clearly defined purpose in the minds of the working men auditors goes far to explain the failure of Mechanics' institutions to help those for whom they were especially started. The driving force of such a purpose is illustrated by the success of the Working Men's college, the much later Ruskin college and, more especially, the University Tutorial classes of the Workers' Educational association<sup>1</sup>.

In spite of the heavy duty on paper (threepence on the pound weight), a periodical like *The Mechanics' Magazine*, devoted to applied science and the processes of manufacture, and published weekly at threepence, secured 'an extensive circulation.' Brougham, therefore, hoped that cheapening the cost of book-production would render possible the publication of reprints of works on ethics, politics and history. This part of the scheme was realised in the publications of the Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge, founded in 1827, with Brougham as its first president. The prevalence, in these works, of the principles which, about that time, came to be known as 'utilitarian,' and the omission of reference to Christian beliefs, caused them to be regarded askance by Thomas Arnold and others, whose genuine interest in the education of working people cannot be questioned. The society's publications (most of them issued by Charles Knight) included *The Penny Magazine* (1832—7), *The Penny Cyclopaedia* (1832, etc.), *The Quarterly Journal of Education* (1831—5), *The Library of Entertaining Knowledge*, *The Library of Useful Knowledge* and an uncompleted *Biographical Dictionary* (1842—4). Lord Brougham and Birkbeck took part in the movement for the abolition of the tax of fourpence a copy levied on newspapers; the tax was reduced in 1836 to one penny, at which figure it remained till its disappearance in 1855.

Reviews of La Place's *Mécanique Céleste* (1808; probably by Playfair) and of Falconer's *Strabo* (1809; in part by Sydney Smith) gave *The Edinburgh* an occasion for attacking the universities, both of which were held responsible for the backward state of mathematical investigation in England. Cambridge made mathematics the great object of study, but, like the sister university, adhered exclusively to antiquated methods; Oxford taught only the rudiments, 'mistaking the infancy of science for its maturity.' According to the reviewer, while the elder university

<sup>1</sup> See Mansbridge, A., *University Tutorial Classes* (1913).

possessed a richly endowed press, it published bad versions of classical texts, edited in 'Oxonian Latin,' whose 'parent language' was no other than the 'vulgar English' of the day. These reviews were followed, in 1810, by Sydney Smith's attack on the public school system of education, the charge against it being that it failed to produce men eminent in science or letters. Edward Copleston, at the moment professor of poetry, defended Oxford in three *Replies* to these 'calumnies,' in which, incidentally, he described the degree examinations and the tutorial system, which he preferred to the professorial lectures of the Scottish universities. But the defence was weak and largely irrelevant. Copleston was on fairly safe ground so long as he argued that a truer education results from the knowledge of men which is conveyed by literature, than from the knowledge of matter and motion which is derived from science. But, when the function of a university is in question, he fails to meet, or even to understand, his adversaries. He held that universities are schools for those who are to become political leaders or clergymen, and that for these classes the humanities are the most fitting instruction. The *Edinburgh* reviewers knew that there were other classes requiring advanced instruction of a kind which the literary curriculum of the English universities could not give. Copleston thought it sufficient to reply that 'miscellaneous knowledge,' as he called it, was 'esteemed and encouraged' at Oxford, though it was 'the subordinate and not the leading business of education.' A man with a well disciplined mind can attain knowledge of this kind 'after he enters into life.' This, of course, was what the critics denied; and, if it were so, the universities were ignoring their duty of research. They were places of education, but not homes of learning or sources of that useful knowledge which the times imperatively required.

Two visits to the newly founded university of Bonn (1818), paid by Thomas Campbell in the summer and autumn of 1820, made a deep impression upon the poet. In particular, he appears to have conceived, at that time, the idea of a university for London which should reproduce the educational aims, scope and professorial organisation of the German model, with which his own Glasgow education predisposed him to sympathise. He mooted the idea among his associates, and finally made it public in a letter to *The Times* (9 February 1825), thus coming into touch with Henry Brougham and the group of thinkers who were anxious for the general diffusion of knowledge and a radical change in English educational institutions. The nonconformist bodies of



London, whose members were virtually shut out from the older universities, heartily welcomed the scheme, and they were joined by churchmen who desired to see in the metropolis a university devoted to modern studies and free from the expense entailed by residence in colleges. So marked was the adhesion of these born opponents, that Campbell feared it would be necessary to provide two theological chairs, one for church and one for dissent; but Brougham succeeded in eliminating divinity from the scheme. In February 1826, the proprietors and donors who had furnished the capital formally constituted themselves 'an institution for the general advancement of literature and science by affording young men opportunities for obtaining literary and scientific education at a moderate expense'; the institution being styled 'the University of London.' The duke of Sussex laid the foundation-stone of the building in Gower street early in 1827 and, on 2 October 1828, lectures began to some 300 students. In the meantime, the church became alarmed at the divorce between education and religion represented by the new establishment. At midsummer, 1828, the duke of Wellington, then prime minister, presided over a public meeting which resolved to found a college for general education in which, while literature and science were subjects of instruction, it should be essential that the doctrines and duties of Christianity, as inculcated by the church of England, should be taught. This second institution received its charter as King's college, London, in August 1829, and the college was opened in October 1831.

One of the gravest objections to the existing English university system made by the innovators was that it reduced the university and its accredited teachers, the professors, to impotence, and installed in their stead the colleges and the tutorial system. This objection was almost savagely urged by Sir William Hamilton in *The Edinburgh Review* (June and December 1831); were the practice reversed, the advancement of knowledge would follow and, incidentally, one serious obstacle to the admission of non-conformists to universities would be removed. In these opinions Thomas Arnold concurred. The institution of two colleges in London, therefore, infringed an essential principle of the scheme introduced by admirers of the Scottish and German organisation of university teaching. The same disregard of this principle was shown in the foundation of the university of Durham in 1832.

Of the two London colleges, the earlier did not succeed in securing a charter, though, in 1831, it came very near doing so.

Both colleges were impeded by the partisan squabbles which were inevitable in consequence of their origin ; but a workable agreement was reached by the ministry of Sir Robert Peel in November 1836. On the same day, the elder college received its charter under the style 'University College, London' and a new corporation was created—

persons eminent in literature and science to act as a board of examiners and to perform all the functions of the examiners in the Senate house of Cambridge; this body to be termed 'The University of London.'

Students of the two colleges alone were at first admissible to these examinations ; but the qualification was, in 1850, extended to a number of affiliated colleges in different parts of the country, the result proving so unsatisfactory that, in 1858, the restriction of affiliation was removed altogether, while it was laid down that (with the exception of certain medical requirements) all degrees and distinctions were to be obtained solely by proficiency shown in the examinations of the university. In other words, its work, henceforth, was confined to examining, a function whose importance was unduly exaggerated in consequence ; the link with the two chief London colleges was, in effect, broken, and the possibility of bringing order and system into the higher education of London was postponed for some forty years.

Hamilton's dislike of the tutorial system and the exaggerated reverence for German educational institutions, which he and Campbell did much to propagate, blinded him to the merits of moderate reforms proposed by such men as William Whewell. In *Thoughts on the Study of Mathematics* (1835), Whewell had contrasted 'philosophy' taught by lectures with mathematics taught tutorially, and had asserted that the latter was by far the more efficient instrument of education ; but the advantage was lost, if the teaching were too abstract and dissociated from 'that great system of physical knowledge... with the character and nature of which no liberally educated man ought to be unacquainted.' He suggested that mechanics and hydrostatics should be included in every examination for the B.A. degree. Hamilton's review<sup>1</sup> was a tiresome piece of pedantry and bad writing, which ignored Whewell's agreement with the contention of the earlier reviewers. The Cambridge tutor turned the tables upon him very happily<sup>2</sup>, and the subsequent history of German universities in their adoption of laboratory and tutorial methods fully justified the position taken by Whewell.

<sup>1</sup> *The Edinburgh Review* (June 1836).

<sup>2</sup> *On the principles of English university education* (1837).

Popular tradition, supported by Stanley's *Life* (1844) and Hughes's *Tom Brown's School Days* (1857), regards Thomas Arnold as the universal reformer or re-creator of public schools. But, so far as the purely professional side of school-keeping is concerned, he was anticipated by Samuel Butler, headmaster of Shrewsbury from 1798 to 1836, of which period only the last eight years fall within Arnold's tenure of office at Rugby (1828—42). The decline from which public schools had suffered was nowhere more evident than at Shrewsbury, where, in 1798, there were not more than twenty boys. Assisted by a reconstituted governing body, Butler built upon this remnant a flourishing school, whose achievements and organisation became models for Eton and Harrow, as Hawtrey, headmaster of Eton from 1834 to 1853, generously acknowledged to Butler himself. Periodical examinations, and a carefully supervised scheme of 'marks' assigned for merit and industry, sustained an emulation that gave new life to the studies of Shrewsbury boys, which was manifested in their extraordinary successes in competition for university scholarships. The responsibility thrown upon 'prepostors'—'the eight boys to whom the master delegates a certain share of authority'—revived an ancient usage whose invention is often ascribed to Arnold alone. The importance which Butler attached to 'private work,' study done in the boys' leisure time and under no supervision, was part of his unwavering policy of training his pupils to initiative and self-reliance<sup>1</sup>. Stanley claimed for Arnold the credit of being the first to introduce modern history, modern languages and mathematics into the regular routine; but, here again, Shrewsbury forestalled Rugby. The truth is, that no public school ventured, of its own motion, to reform curriculum. Even the preparation of Latin and Greek grammars for common use throughout the schools, a project of Arnold in 1835, had to wait till 1866 for partial realisation in *The Public School Latin Primer*. The admission of mathematics, modern history and geography to full recognition as studies was a surrender to public opinion and a tardy imitation of the custom of commercial or 'English' schools, chiefly under private management, which educated the great majority of the middle classes. But not much came of the introduction of these studies into public schools, as the Clarendon commission of 1861—4 complained. Arnold was of opinion that it was 'not right' to leave boys and young men 'in ignorance of the beginnings of physical science'; nearly thirty years later, this royal commission was saying the same thing. The

<sup>1</sup> Fisher, G. W., *Annals of Shrewsbury School*, p. 362.

first steps in a real reform of courses of instruction among schools of this type were taken by the early Victorian foundations, chiefly proprietary, such as Cheltenham, Liverpool, Marlborough, Rossall, Brighton, Radley and Bradfield.

But Arnold's claim to greatness does not rest upon any purely professional achievement. His moral earnestness and strong religious conviction were naturally reflected in his administration of Rugby, as, also, was his intense belief in the responsibility of his position. His moral fervour, accompanied though it was by much heart-searching and an abiding distrust of the immaturity of boy-nature, worked an extraordinary change in the life of Rugby, and, through Rugby, in public schools and in English education at large. In his view, 'the forming of the moral principles and habits' alone constituted education, and, in this country, the process must be based on Christianity. On the latter ground, he desired the admission of all nonconformists, unitarians excepted, to the full membership of Oxford and Cambridge; and he regretfully resigned his seat (1838) in the senate of the newly created university of London because he failed to carry his colleagues with him in an acknowledgment of the paramount claim of religion in public education. He regarded with pity and apprehension the material condition of the working classes during the last years of his life; nor is it possible to measure the influence upon social reform which, at a much later time, he exercised through his pupils and admirers.

Falling trade, poor harvests, dear bread and the shock of a salutary but radical change in poor-law administration brought acute distress upon the working classes, more particularly during the years which immediately followed the passing of the first Reform bill. The consequent unrest was intensified by the feeling that that measure had not gone far enough along the road of reform. While some sought to remove or alleviate the trouble by further political or fiscal changes, others saw in the careful upbringing of the children the promise of permanent improvement.

William Ellis, William Ballantyne Hodgson and Richard Dawes, dean of Hereford, hoped to remedy the evil plight of the poorer classes by careful moral training independent of religious teaching, and by 'the introduction of lessons on economical science into schools of primary instruction'; George Combe, the phrenologist, and William Lovett, the 'moral force Chartist,' were, at different times, associated with Ellis in this project. Ellis was the most active in the cause; between 1848 and 1862, he opened in London seven schools (usually called Birkbeck schools, from the fact that

the first of them was held in the London Mechanics' institution<sup>1</sup>), instructed teachers in his aims and methods, wrote, lectured and aroused considerable interest in his ideas among teachers and school managers. The Prince Consort, in pursuance of the eclectic scheme of education which he laid down for his children, succeeded in making Ellis a sort of 'visiting master' at Buckingham palace for upwards of a year. The special feature of the Birkbeck schools was the attention given to instruction relating to bodily health and to 'the science of human well-being,' that is, the practical application of the principles of political economy to individual conduct. Most of these schools failed to compete with the board schools created by the Education act of 1870; one or two of them still survive as secondary schools assisted by the county council. It was a sound instinct which led Ellis to train his teachers himself; his aims required for their attainment, as he often said, something of 'apostolic' fervour, which could not be expected from all teachers as a matter of course.

John Ruskin never ceased to denounce the blindness of political economists; William Ellis, while confessing the charm of Ruskin and other men of letters who touched economic problems, thought that they one and all 'failed to convince.' Yet, these two men were in substantial agreement as to the kind of up-bringing which their fellow-countrymen needed. Moral training and enlightenment, bodily health, knowledge and skill applied to the daily calling were the great matters; an intelligent apprehension of his physical surroundings, some instruction in science and mathematics, the thrifty employment of his wages, the attainment of leisure and ability to enjoy it worthily were the next important factors of the future workman's education. Ruskin, fully cognisant of the value for mental development of bodily activity and manual skill, thought 'riding, rowing and cricketing' the most useful things learned at a public school; he would have boys of all ranks taught a handicraft. But the man of letters and the student of economics viewed the whole subject from opposite standpoints; Ellis was thinking of the individual, Ruskin of the community. Throughout the seventeen years, dating from the appearance of *The Stones of Venice* in 1853, during which he kept the subject before the public, education and government were inseparable ideas in his mind. 'Educate or govern, they are one and the same word,' he said at Woolwich in 1869<sup>2</sup>. It was government's duty to provide free, universal instruction and to compel all to receive education;

<sup>1</sup> See, *ante*, p. 408.

<sup>2</sup> *The Crown of Wild Olive*, par. 144.

in return, all must yield obedience to government. 'All prosperity begins in obedience<sup>1</sup>'; as Carlyle had said long before in *Sartor Resartus*, 'obedience is our universal duty and destiny; wherein whoso will not bend must break.' Ruskin's first object was an organised and, above all, a disciplined people; his model was the Prussian polity as shaped, first, by Frederick the great and, secondly, by Frederick William's ministers after the disaster of Jena.

The policy of reform initiated by the Oxford Examination statute of 1800 developed slowly at Oxford and Cambridge during the succeeding fifty years. At the former, the single 'school,' or examination for the degree, was made two by the institution of the mathematical school in 1807. In similar fashion, the solitary Cambridge 'tripos' (virtually a mathematical examination) became two in 1824 by the establishment of the classical tripos. At Oxford, the 'honours' and 'pass' examinations were separated, and an increasing quantity of written work was demanded from candidates. In 1850, Oxford recast its arrangements. A new test, 'The First Public Examination before Moderators' (who were empowered to award honours), was set up mid-way in the degree course, and two new schools, Natural Science and Law and Modern History were made; subsequently, the latter school became two and Theology was added. A similar recognition of modern studies was made at Cambridge in 1848 by the creation of the Moral Sciences and Natural Sciences triposes, these two examinations both comprehending a very wide range of studies. But the agitation for reform first powerfully expressed by *The Edinburgh Review* was not relaxed. Even improvements intensified it. The interest aroused by classical and mathematical examinations absorbed attention from other studies; professorial lectures were neglected in favour of teaching by college tutors, which bore directly upon the struggle for honours and degrees. At Oxford, in 1850, out of 1500 or 1600 students, the average attendance at the modern history course was eight; at the chemistry course, five and a half; at botany, six; at Arabic, none; 'medicine, Anglo-Saxon and Sanscrit are in a similar condition.' The regius professor of Greek did not lecture, no pupils offering themselves. 'Indeed the main body of professors are virtually superseded by the present system. Oxford, instead of being one great university, consists of twenty-four small universities called colleges<sup>2</sup>.'

<sup>1</sup> *The Crown of Wild Olive*, par. 134.

<sup>2</sup> *A Letter to...Lord John Russell...with suggestions for a Royal Commission of*

Reformers traced most of the abuses prevalent in the universities to this subordinate position of the university corporations themselves. The heads of the college societies formed an oligarchy which, entrenched behind obsolete statutes and traditional glosses centuries old, in effect governed the university upon a basis of privilege. In closest association with the church, the authorities at Oxford excluded nonconformists absolutely, whilst Cambridge refused to admit them to degrees, the effect being to shut them out from any share in honours or powers of government. Competition for fellowships and other college emoluments was frequently nullified by statutes of endowment which restricted candidates to particular localities, schools or families. As the universities themselves were legally incompetent to change the condition of affairs, a memorial, supported by many Oxford and Cambridge graduates, was addressed, in 1850, to the prime minister, lord John Russell, requesting the appointment of a royal commission to make enquiry and suggest reform. The request was promptly granted and the commission reported in 1852. Parliamentary legislation (1854—6) and the amendment of college statutes, which it made possible, broke the college monopoly of university government, enlarged the professoriate and endowed it with college funds considered superfluous, freed colleges from obsolete obligations, in large measure threw open fellowships and other prizes and removed disabilities which prevented nonconformists from taking degrees, though without enabling them to hold fellowships. The consequence of these radical changes was an extraordinary access of new life in all branches of the universities' activity and a closer approach to the life of the nation than had been witnessed for nearly two hundred years.

The principle of undenominational education embodied in the university of London was extended to Ireland in 1844—9 by the foundation of Queen's colleges at Belfast, Cork and Galway and their incorporation as Queen's university in the next year, notwithstanding the protests of Daniel O'Connell, the Irish Roman catholic bishops and Pius IX. The hierarchy determined to establish a catholic university in Dublin and to place John Henry Newman at its head; the university was canonically founded in 1854, Newman being its first rector. He had acted in that

*Inquiry into the Universities* (1850), p. 19. This pamphlet (by Row, C. A.) is a searching statement of the grievances which led to the appointment of the royal commissions of 1850—2.

capacity previous to the formal opening, and, during 1852, he delivered those addresses on the scope and nature of higher education which were published under the title, *The Idea of a University*<sup>1</sup>. These discourses deliberately traversed those conceptions of knowledge and of instruction which, first rendered powerful by Brougham and the utilitarians, had become very popular doctrines in the mid-century. In opposition to the demand that universities should place research and the advancement of knowledge in the forefront of their activities, Newman asserted that the chief business of a university is to teach, and in particular to illuminate the intelligence and to inculcate habits of accurate, thorough and systematic thinking. Notwithstanding its many acknowledged benefits, the diffusion of useful knowledge tended to support false, illiberal notions of what constituted instruction, to tolerate smattering and to prepare and make current 'nutshell views for the breakfast table.' While the prevailing idea was to separate theology and religious teaching from all educational institutions, Newman asserted that, as all knowledge, fundamentally, is one, the knowledge of God cannot be divorced from other forms of knowledge without causing general injury to knowledge as a whole. The elimination of theology meant that some other branch of knowledge would usurp the vacant place to its own detriment. At a time when reformers regarded professors' lectures and examinations as the most efficient mode of university education, Newman ventured upon an outspoken justification of the practice of the ancient universities and public schools, the enforcement of college residence and tutorial supervision. The moving passage in which he reverts to his Oriel days is well known; so, too, is the taunt directed at the Baconian philosophy, 'a method whereby bodily discomforts and temporal wants are to be most effectually removed from the greatest number.' Science and literature must both occupy a great place in university education. But the former ignores sin, and the latter knows it only too well. 'It is a contradiction in terms to attempt a sinless literature of sinful man'—a home-thrust at the sixteenth-century compromise known as *pietas litterata*. Therefore, the church must fashion and mould the university's organisation, watch over its teaching, knit its pupils together and superintend its action. The suppressed premiss in this argument (an infallible church) fails to conceal the prosaic fact that the moulding and fashioning must be committed, not to

<sup>1</sup> See, *ante*, vol. XII, chap. XII.



an abstract entity, but to the hands of possibly very fallible and always concrete ecclesiastics.

Shortly before parliament, in 1833, voted £20,000 *per annum* in aid of schools for the people, John Arthur Roebuck unsuccessfully moved a resolution in the commons in favour of universal, compulsory education, the professional training of teachers in normal schools and the appointment of a minister of education, in all these proposals avowedly following the example of Prussia and of France. The state policy here outlined was only partially realised during the ensuing seventy years, throughout which period it was almost continuously discussed. The appointment in 1839 of a committee of the privy council on education to 'superintend the application of any sums voted by Parliament for the purpose of promoting public education' was an assumption of direct responsibility by the state which promised to have far-reaching consequences. But the committee suffered defeat at the very outset. The first requirement of a great system of public education was the existence of a body of competent teachers. Lord Melbourne's ministry, therefore, proposed to establish a national normal school, the details of their plan being committed to the secretary of the committee, James Phillips Kay (Sir James Kay-Shuttleworth), a close student of Swiss educational practice.

In order to maintain religious instruction as an integral part of the scheme, and to respect 'the rights of conscience,' it was proposed to give both denominational and undenominational instruction in such a manner as to safeguard conscientious objectors. But this was to raise the 'religious difficulty' in connection with a policy not too popular on other grounds; and so loud was the clamour, that the government threw over the training college scheme as a whole and confined itself to the appointment of inspectors of schools. The National society and the British and Foreign School society had, from the beginning of their history, trained their teachers; this 'voluntary' arrangement was continued and the number of training colleges was greatly increased by different religious bodies after the government's failure in 1839. In 1846, the committee of council, still intent on the creation of a corps of teachers, materially altered the monitory system by permitting teachers to engage apprentices, or pupil-teachers, who, after five years' service in the receipt of government pay, became eligible by examination for admission to one of the 'voluntary' training colleges, which the state aided. The system of apprenticeship for teachers has undergone great

changes since its introduction ; but denominational training colleges still take part with universities and university colleges (since 1890) and municipal training colleges (since the legislation of 1902) in the preparation of teachers for the work of elementary schools.

A greater admission of state responsibility was made in 1856 by the establishment of the Education department for the supervision of elementary education ; with this department was associated that of Science and Art, a public office which had been created three years earlier. The ministries of Aberdeen and Palmerston were marked by a series of abortive bills (1853—8) designed to bring public elementary instruction under public control in conjunction with expedients to meet the religious difficulty or to ignore it. Both parties to the controversy agreed that more information on the working of the existing arrangement was required, and, in 1858, the Newcastle commission was appointed for the purpose, and to report on measures likely to extend 'sound and cheap elementary instruction to all classes of the people.' The commissioners' report (1861) complained that elementary schools, as a whole, neglected the rudiments and the less capable children. Their outstanding recommendation was that the financial aid given to any school should depend, in part, upon the attainments of its pupils as determined by the inspector's examination ; effect was given to this recommendation by Robert Lowe's 'revised code' of 1862, which introduced what is known as 'payment by results.' This specious phrase won public favour for a very mischievous method of administration. In the first place, as Kay-Shuttleworth strongly urged, there was no 'payment' for those moral 'results' which were the best outcome of the schoolmaster's labours, and his devotion was diverted from these to the bare rudiments of knowledge which could be assessed and paid for. The school depended for its existence upon the capacity of the children to read, write and sum ; the ability to use these tools in acquiring knowledge and, still more, the manual exercises, which hitherto had formed part of the education of children of handicraftsmen and labourers, were, in consequence, thrust aside. In the struggle for grants, the teaching, neglecting the intelligent, was adapted to the lowest capacity and became very mechanical, as Matthew Arnold pointed out at an early stage in the system's history. Poorer schools, unable to employ teachers skilled in securing the highest 'results,' found, to their cost, that the watchword of the new order was *habentibus dabitur*, and their attempt to keep going was a weary business for all concerned. Until the system

was abolished in 1890, attempts at improvement or palliation were, from time to time, made by the Education department in response to pressure from teachers and school-managers.

The decade preceding 1870 was notable by reason of its active interest in public instruction of all grades, and this activity was reflected in certain noteworthy books. Among these the most conspicuous was Herbert Spencer's *Education, Intellectual, Moral and Physical* (1861), in which the author collected magazine articles published by him between 1854 and 1859. The book completes a series constituted by Montaigne, Locke, Rousseau and Spencer himself, which marks the continued reaction during three centuries of French and English thought upon its special topic. Spencer's work is largely Rousseau's *Émile* in nineteenth-century English guise. Of the four chapters into which it is divided, the second, on intellectual education, is, perhaps, the most valuable; it is the nearest approach to a treatise on educational method which we have from the pen of an English writer of distinction, and much of its teaching has been absorbed into modern practice. The next chapter, on moral education, follows Rousseau, and, like *Émile*, does nothing to solve its problem. The so-called discipline of consequences as expounded by both writers would train the pupil to be wary in dealing with natural forces; but this is not morality. The fourth chapter, on physical education, has been generally recognised as sound, and as having had a valuable influence upon subsequent practice. The first chapter ('What knowledge is of most worth?'), which is a piece of special pleading for instruction in science, teems with fallacies, some of a very crude kind. Spencer appears to have been by nature unresponsive to art and literature; given this defect, and a good conceit of his own judgment, many of the author's *dicta* can be understood. But, after all, a more judicious handling of the theme of his chapter would have been quite ineffective in face of the scandalous neglect of science, as an instrument of general education, which then prevailed in this country. *Education* had an extraordinary vogue; within less than twenty years it was translated into thirteen foreign languages, including Chinese and Japanese; Spencer's great repute among the latter is well known.

The Newcastle commission of 1858—61 on the education of the poorer classes was followed by the Clarendon or Public Schools commission of 1861—4 and the Taunton or Endowed Schools commission of 1864—7; during the last named period, also, the Argyll commission investigated the condition of Scottish schools.

The Clarendon commissioners frankly recognised the improvements, moral and material, which had been made in the daily life of the nine schools to which their reference restricted them; they praised their adherence to humane letters, their discipline, moral and religious training, though they thought the schools were too tender to idlers. But the curriculum lacked breadth and variety; every boy should be taught mathematics, a branch of natural science and a modern foreign language. The Public Schools act of 1868 recast the governing bodies and gave them power to make new regulations for the management of their schools, including the provision of new studies; but, so far as the state was concerned, Winchester, Eton, St Paul's, Westminster, Harrow, Rugby, Shrewsbury, Merchant Taylors' and Charterhouse were left very much as they were before. The Taunton commission was appointed to discover measures 'for the improvement of secondary education.' Though the endowed school foundations numbered about three thousand, more than two thousand of them fell outside the purview of the commission, as they were giving purely elementary instruction. The commissioners reported a great lack of secondary schools and much inefficiency in the existing teachers, school buildings and governing bodies. They recommended a comprehensive scheme of national and local provision for, and control of, the whole sphere of education between the elementary and the public school; but parliament was content to appoint, under the Endowed Schools acts, 1869—74, commissioners with power to initiate, or amend, the schemes which controlled the operations of individual schools. This power was freely exercised until the functions of these commissioners were transferred, in 1874, to the Charity commission, with which body they remained down to 1900. Speaking generally, school schemes dealt with by both these bodies make the benefits of the school widely accessible, provide for the inclusion of modern studies, for exemption of certain pupils from religious instruction and (where necessary) for the abolition of the ancient jurisdiction of the bishop of the diocese.

The Newcastle and Taunton commissions are associated with the first steps taken by Matthew Arnold to awaken England to the defective state of such public education as it possessed. Appointed an inspector of schools in 1851, Arnold was despatched to the continent on special missions of observation by the first-named commission in 1859, and by the second in 1865. His reports (*The popular education of France with notices of that of Holland and Switzerland*, 1861, *Schools and Universities on*

*the Continent*, 1868) concentrated attention upon the condition of the English middle class, 'nearly the worst educated in the world,' served by schools destitute of great traditions and too frequently inspired by narrow or vulgar ideals. Whereas, abroad, the commercial and industrial class participated in the highest culture of the nation, in England that class, notwithstanding its great political power, was isolated from that culture, and, being without a good standard of education in its own experience, was unable to form a just estimate of the country's needs in that respect. From the first, Arnold was struck by the high level of intellectual attainment promoted by the French *lycée* and the comparatively large area of its influence. But only the state could meet the expense of a sufficient number of these schools, supply their highly educated trained teachers and maintain a good standard by means of official inspection. The same wide extension of culture attained by similar means was observable in Germany, in Holland and in democratic Switzerland. Though the occasion of his first tour was the primary school, Arnold recognised that the organisation of elementary instruction on a national scale, apart from the consideration of secondary and higher education, would be futile as well as illogical. Hence, his first report admonished the English people to 'regard the necessities of a not distant future and *organise your secondary instruction.*' That admonition he continued to repeat throughout his official career; it concludes the report on German, Swiss and French elementary education which he drew up on his retirement in 1886. In the interval, expostulation, satire, sarcasm, persuasion, exhortation were all employed to urge the English community to assume corporate responsibility for public education as a whole; the voluntary principle was incapable of meeting the absolute needs of a modern state. England could no more do without universal, compulsory instruction than could her neighbours.

Arnold died before the organisation of secondary education was taken in hand; but his teaching did not fail to tell in due course, as the Bryce commission of 1896 proved. In order to fix responsibility (the want of which he regarded as one of the sins of our administration generally), the national system should be presided over by a minister of education, who should be assisted by a consultative body of persons entitled to be heard on questions affecting his duties. The schools should form part of the municipal services, and, as municipal organisation did not yet exist in many parts of the country, it would have to be created. As intermediary

between the localities and the ministry, 'provincial school boards,' eight or ten for the country, would ensure a national policy, which respected local wishes, while they would render unnecessary an elaborate scheme of inspection such as was employed for existing elementary schools. A school-leaving certificate, open to all secondary school pupils, would also serve as qualification for admission to the university. The universities, by offering facilities for post-graduate study, might compensate for the want of those foreign 'institutes' which trained members of the public services scientifically and, at the same time, raised the whole level of national appreciation of knowledge and the value of ideas. A comparison of the foregoing with the subsequent development of educational policy shows what Arnold's influence in these matters was.

On the long-established controversy about curriculum, Arnold took an equally comprehensive view. 'The rejection of the humanities... and the rejection of the study of nature are alike *ignorant*.' The aim of the pupil is to attain 'knowledge of himself and of the world.' Secondary schools, in their lower forms, should, therefore, provide a basis of instruction common to all pupils; above this, there should be a bifurcation, one branch for literary, the other for scientific, education. Following the model of the Prussian *Realgymnasium* (established in 1859 and since fallen into disfavour), Arnold included the elements of Latin among the common studies of all pupils; in another connection, he suggested that the Latin *Vulgate* should be studied by the more advanced pupils of elementary schools. But, of course, he was fully alive to the humanist training to be obtained from the study of modern literatures, especially that of the mother-tongue; on the other hand, he thought that instruction in speaking foreign languages was not school business.

John Stuart Mill's *Inaugural Address* to the university of St Andrews on being installed lord rector in February 1867, while not neglecting the controversies of the hour, raises the discussion about education to a level which controversies seldom reach. He agrees with Newman that British universities discharge, among other functions, that of advanced schools; but, he thinks this is owing to the absence of schools to which general education could be fully entrusted. Yet, the Scots universities have long since so organised their studies as to make an all-round education possible for their students; and 'the old English universities... are now the *foci* of free and manly enquiry to the higher and professional classes south of the Tweed.' The assumed opposition between

literature and science is an absurdity; anything deserving the name of a good education must include both. If classics were better taught, there would be sufficient time for the teaching of science and of 'everything else needed'; but the greater part of English classical schools are shams which fail to teach what they profess. He would not have modern languages, history or geography taught in secondary schools; the first should be learned abroad, and the other two by desultory reading. Here, he altogether fails to see the part which, by the systematic instruction of the school, these studies may be made to play in a child's development; all through the address there is ever present the recollection of his own arduous discipline (as described in his *Autobiography*) and forgetfulness of the limits to the ordinary boy's industry and power. In reference to another heated quarrel of the time, Mill roundly declares it beyond the power of schools and universities to educate morally or religiously, and then goes on to show that the home and 'society' can do this, omitting to note that schools and universities are societies, and that, from the standpoint of education, religion is not so much a philosophy or set of intellectual ideas to be taught as a life to be lived. The *Autobiography* supplies the source of the error. But Mill does not confine himself to the place of schools and universities; he passes in review the branches of culture which should be followed when education has, ostensibly, been completed. The 'aesthetic branch' of human culture is barely inferior to the other branches, the intellectual and moral; yet, the British middle class neglects it for 'commercial, money-getting business and religious puritanism,' the condition of things which, two years later, Matthew Arnold sharply flagellated in *Culture and Anarchy*. Mill's *Inaugural Address* and Newman's *Idea of a University*, when made mutually corrective, portray ideals of individual attainment which it is hard to imagine irrelevant at any stage of human civilisation.

The ground taken by Mill in reference to literature and science is that occupied by the nine distinguished writers who, under the editorship of Frederic William Farrar, published, in 1867, *Essays on a liberal education*. Henry Sidgwick, senior classic in 1859, writing on the theory of classical education, dismisses, as sophistical, many of the stock contentions in its favour; he is particularly severe when commenting on the assertions of 'the enthusiast, Mr Thring.' Sidgwick urges that the ancient authors are fine educational instruments just because their work is literature, and,

on that ground, it is reasonable to employ, for a like purpose, the literature of modern tongues. He admits the claim of natural science to its place in modern education, favours the reform of methods of teaching Latin and Greek, and, in particular, would remove 'verses' from among compulsory studies, a contention to which the editor, Farrar, devotes his own essay. After the senior classic, the senior wrangler: James Maurice Wilson contributes a weighty and temperately written essay on behalf of science, which is the more convincing since it illustrates, with some detail, the serious work which boys may undertake, even when they give only two hours a week to it. John Wesley Hales, in an essay on the teaching of English, urged that a child's first notions of grammar should be derived from study of the vernacular, a rule very generally accepted at the present time. Sir John Seeley (then professor of Latin at University college, London), writing on liberal education in universities, confined himself to defects in the tutorial system of the colleges, to the baneful effects of examinations and of the exaggerated importance attached to 'tripses' and 'schools.' He suggested, as remedies, the alphabetical arrangement of all 'honours' lists, the institution of intercollegiate lectures and a greater readiness on the part of colleges to admit members of other societies to fellowships—matters of organisation now generally in operation.

Edward Thring, 'the enthusiast' of Sidgwick's essay, was headmaster of Uppingham school from 1853 till his death in 1887, during which period he raised a small, country grammar school to the educational level of the best public schools of the new foundation, he and his staff contributing nearly the whole of the capital sum required to effect the change in the material conditions of the school. To these conditions he attached high value, and he spared no pains to acquire buildings planned to meet the manifold requirements of a modern school, apparatus and appliances to advance or illustrate its studies, comely school-rooms and domestic surroundings which respected the boys' privacy. His best known book, *Theory and Practice of Teaching*, is not a professional treatise, but a series of disconnected chapters full of shrewd observation and practical hints expressed in a rugged yet epigrammatic style, which makes good reading. In his books, as in his daily work, he insisted that schools must be judged by their success in educating the dull and the mediocre boy, and not by examinations or by readiness to comply with the official craving for uniformity. Himself of a masterful disposition, he could not



tolerate any interference with, or attempt to ignore, the individuality either of scholar or of school.

The Reform bill of 1832 had led the state to assume a very small measure of responsibility for public instruction; but mere trifling could not satisfy the demand for popular education heightened by the much greater extension of the parliamentary franchise effected in the bill of 1867. Nearly as many children were believed to be without schools of any kind as were in attendance at all schools, state-aided or uninspected, put together. Abortive bills and resolutions in parliament urged the imposition of an education rate, the provision of free education and the safeguard of a conscience clause in schools. Outside parliament, there was loud and persistent agitation, which centred chiefly about the question of religious instruction and the rights of conscience. Finally, in 1870, the government introduced a bill to provide for public elementary education in England and Wales, which was passed after six months of contentious debate. Its introducer, William Edward Forster, explained that its purpose was supplementary, to ensure an efficient school in every part of the kingdom, to make the erection of such schools compulsory where they did not already exist, but to use compulsion in such cases only; for this purpose, it was requisite to maintain an effectual conscience clause, undenominational inspection and a standard of efficiency in secular study. In the course of the debates, it was decided that ratepayers, not town councils or vestries, should elect school boards (the education authorities formed by the bill), to take voluntary schools out of the measure and to forbid the teaching in board schools of any formulary distinctive of a particular religious body. This last clause favoured, at the expense of all other denominations, that which was completely satisfied by bible-reading. However expedient at the moment, it was but an imperfect compromise which did not really solve the religious difficulty; it merely kept it alive. But the full significance of the Education act of 1870 lies in the fact that the English state then definitely assumed direct responsibility for public education, whose provision became a state service like that of defence or the administration of justice; it was no longer a matter of private charity conducted by the well-to-do for the benefit of the poor. For the time being, this responsibility was confined to elementary instruction; but its extension was unavoidable. The lack of schools drove most school boards into activities which rendered the 'supplementary' nature of the act a wrong description, and the

boards themselves became great corporations which overshadowed the voluntary system they had been created to supplement. The principle of universally compulsory education was asserted, but it was so fenced by the permissive powers granted to the boards and by the want of schools as not unfrequently to be inoperative. The principle was enforced by an act passed in 1880, rather more than a year in advance of the French compulsory law.

Alexander Bain's *Education as a science* (1879) contains little which justifies its title. Much more is made of 'the three great functions of the intellect in the ultimate analysis—Discrimination, Agreement, Retentiveness,' than of the subject proper; while education, as an art, bulks as considerably as anything else in the book. These two parts lack cohesion. The purely psychological discussion meanders interminably, twin rocks called pleasure and pain, otherwise reward and punishment, standing up in mid-stream and everywhere visible, recalling the parental Calvinism, with its ever-present alternatives, heaven and hell. Perhaps the same grim creed accounts for Bain's opinion that 'the quintessence of play' is 'the zest of the malevolent feeling'; Montaigne and Locke knew better. The chapters on the sequence of studies and of the intellectual powers are more to the point, yet, still, there is an exasperating diffuseness, and much which appears to be merely an *apologia* for 'hearing lessons' and for the established usage generally. The 'education values' of different studies are stated as they train intelligence or impart useful information; but they are not equated, and the results do not affect the consideration of a 'renovated curriculum' in science, the humanities and the mother-tongue. Bain was singularly unfortunate in forecasting the trend of practice. He regarded manual instruction and bodily regimen generally as outside the school's province, thought laboratories unnecessary and hesitated about admitting history; but he devotes much attention to the now universally discredited 'object-lesson.'

The duties of Bain's chair of logic at Aberdeen included the teaching of English, work which brought him into the line of the Scottish school already mentioned<sup>1</sup>. Archbishop Whately's treatise, *Rhetoric* (1828), a contribution to the *Encyclopaedia Metropolitana*, had presented its subject as a branch of logic, namely argumentative composition. Bain used the term rhetoric to cover all kinds of literary composition, and, like other members of the school, tried to form a psychological groundwork for its

<sup>1</sup> See, *ante*, p. 398.

principles. While he was more successful in this respect than his predecessors, the connection between his prescriptions and the underlying laws of mental process is not always evident ; but, in the absence of a well-founded psychology of aesthetic, this is not surprising. The sharp line between composition and literature drawn in Bain's latest work on rhetoric (*On teaching English*, 1887) reduces the teacher to a narrow specialist and deprives the study of letters of its highest educational office.

The great advance in the education of girls and women, which has been a prominent feature of recent educational history, may be traced back to the early activities of the Governesses' Benevolent institution, founded in 1843. From the first, this advance has been closely connected with movements directed primarily to make teaching a profession for women. The institution soon found that it could be most helpful to governesses by making them capable of the work they undertook. For this purpose, it secured the gratuitous cooperation of F. D. Maurice and other professors of King's college, London, who began by examining women as to their fitness to teach and then, as the result of experience, conducted classes in which women could receive the necessary instruction. Queen's college, London, was founded in 1848 as a home for these classes and others for the education of girls and women ; among the first teacher-pupils were Frances Mary Buss and Dorothea Beale, who afterwards became the leaders of reform in girls' education. The relationship between King's college and Queen's college was repeated between University college and Bedford college for Women by the foundation of the latter in 1849, with a distinguished body of professors from the former as teachers, and Harriet Martineau as secretary. A committee of ladies, of which Emily Davies was secretary, induced the Taunton or Endowed Schools commission of 1864—7 to enquire into the condition of girls' schools ; the commission's report stated that, in the education of girls, there were a want of thoroughness and of system, slovenliness and showy superficiality, inattention to rudiments and waste of time on accomplishments which were badly taught. The remedy, obviously, was to educate the teachers and to make possible a higher education for women, for which purpose the energetic women who had the cause at heart turned to the universities. In 1865, girls were allowed to present themselves at the 'Local' examinations of Cambridge, and, in this way, periodical authoritative statements as to girls' education were made possible. In 1869, Cambridge and London universities instituted

examinations for women. Emily Davies then started the college at Hitchin which, in 1873, was removed to Girton; in 1869, courses of lectures were begun in Cambridge, which led to the foundation of Newnham college. A period of great expansion followed. With the help of the Endowed Schools commissioners, many girls' schools were opened or revived, many endowments on revision were divided between boys' schools and girls' schools. In 1871, 'The National Union for improving the education of women of all classes' (among whose founders lady Stanley of Alderley and Emily Shirreff, Mistress of Girton College, were prominent) took up the concurrent policy of starting good, cheap day-schools for girls and of making teaching by women a profession. The policy was realised in the creation of The Girls' Public Day School company in 1872 and of The Maria Grey Training college in 1878. The university of London threw open its degree examinations to women in 1878, Cambridge opened the triposes to them in 1881, and, three years later, Oxford allowed women to pass the examinations of certain of its 'schools.' Colleges for women had been instituted at Oxford in 1879. The new universities made no distinction of sex in respect of teaching, emoluments or degrees. The project of a women's university which animates Tennyson's *Princess* (1847) has failed to secure favour; but the less unsubstantial elements of the poet's 'medley' have come near to realisation.

No doubt, girls' schools, at the beginning, voluntarily handicapped themselves by trying to teach most of the things taught in boys' schools, as well as those things which women either need to know, or are conventionally expected to know, or to be skilled in. But this mistake was not slow to disclose itself and be corrected. On the other hand, they were not handicapped by traditional methods; and the professional bent encouraged by the advocates of a better education for girls gave the teachers a critical attitude towards educational principles and their own work which has resulted in a high level of teaching and of organisation, and a freedom from routine. If this professional bias also tended to present teaching as the most appropriate occupation of women—which could scarcely fail to affect courses of study—later experience has reduced these early tendencies to their due proportion.

Apart from its administrative character, the relation of the colleges of Oxford and Cambridge to the universities underwent no great immediate change in consequence of the legislation of 1854—6. The energy of college tutors was expended on the education of

undergraduates; it was almost a commonplace of speakers and writers that, in striking contrast with some foreign universities, Oxford and Cambridge produced but little original work in science or learning. No reformers were more dissatisfied with the state of affairs than many of the university teachers themselves. Newman believed that a university could not at the same time be a place of education and a home of research and learning; Mark Pattison, on the contrary, boldly asserted that, unless teachers were actively engaged in advancing knowledge, their teaching would be inadequate and barren.

All attempts to stimulate the teaching activity [of Oxford] without adding to its solid possession of the field of science will only feed the unwholesome system of examinations which is now undermining the educational value of the work we actually do<sup>1</sup>.

As Pattison read the early history of colleges, their founders intended them for the promotion of learning and the technical instruction of priests, ecclesiastical lawyers and men of affairs; the most urgently needed reform was the appropriation of a large part of the college revenues to the encouragement of research and the provision of the highest type of scientific technical instruction. It was Pattison's hope that such a readjustment of finances would ensure a numerous body of fairly paid teachers, who would have time and opportunity to continue their own studies, to the advantage of the world beyond their own lecture rooms. The act of 1877, which appointed, in both universities, commissions with executive powers to deal with college statutes, rendered possible the partial realisation of this policy. The abolition of religious tests at Oxford, Cambridge and Durham in 1871 removed the last disability which rested upon nonconformists, with the double advantage of admitting them into the full current of national education and of rendering university life a truer mirror of the life of the nation at large. The greatly increased activities of both universities since 1870 are reflected in the number and variety of 'schools' and 'tripses' instituted since that date.

The growth of 'university colleges' (under this or some similar name), which was remarkable during the period 1872—84, was the result of the development of physical science, of a better appreciation of the dependence of industry upon science and a more widely extended faith in the power conferred by knowledge and intellectual cultivation, added to a growing sense of our national deficiencies in these respects. In some places, these

<sup>1</sup> *Suggestions on academical organisation* (1868).

currents of opinion were strengthened or liberalised by 'university extension,' the movement in favour of which was due, in the first place, to the desire, already described, of making teaching a profession for women. In 1867, James Stuart was invited to give lectures to women on the art of teaching. He preferred, however, to deliver a course on astronomy, which he repeated in several of the great northern cities. These lectures proved the existence of a demand for teaching which Cambridge met in the following year by inaugurating the plan of extra-mural lecturing and tuition, a plan adopted by the London society (instituted in 1876) and by Oxford in 1878. The development of all these new centres of intellectual life led, in due course, to the creation of new universities, none of which is confined to the study of science, applied or pure, while some have already made notable contributions to the advancement of letters in many directions.

Owens college, founded so far back as 1851 in response to demands very like those which had led to the creation of the university of London, was the earliest of the university colleges outside the capital to seek academical independence. In 1880, a royal charter was granted to Victoria university with its seat in Manchester, and Owens college was, at first, its only college. In 1884, it was joined by University college, Liverpool, and, in 1887, by the Yorkshire college, Leeds, as constituted colleges of the university. A university charter having been granted to Mason's college, Birmingham, in 1900, the three colleges of Victoria university were by fresh charters created the Victoria university of Manchester (1903), the university of Liverpool (1903) and that of Leeds (1904) respectively. The university of Sheffield was founded in 1905, and that of Bristol in 1909. University college, Dundee, had been affiliated to the university of St Andrews in 1897; and the Irish university system had been remodelled in 1880 and 1908—9.

The University of London act of 1898 led to the restoration of its teaching function and the possibility of unifying the higher education of the metropolis. It is worth remarking that, of the eleven universities now existing south of Tweed, nine were founded later than the reign of George IV. 'I wish we had several more universities,' said Seeley, 'our material progress has outrun our intellectual<sup>1</sup>.' The worship of material success and the indifference to 'ideas' with which Mill, Arnold, Pattison, Seeley and others charged the English middle class are, perhaps, not much less

<sup>1</sup> *Essays on a liberal education* (1867).

prevalent today than they were fifty years ago; but the agents for overcoming them and the reasons why they should be overcome have, in the interval, been greatly multiplied.

Wales preceded England in the organisation of secondary education. The Welsh Intermediate Education act of 1889 gave the principality a scheme which filled the gap between public elementary schools and her three colleges, Aberystwyth, Cardiff and Bangor; the system was completed by the incorporation of these colleges as the university of Wales in 1893. English legislation of 1889—90, dealing with technical instruction, brought about a chaos which rendered organisation imperative. The immediate consequence of the acts of parliament was to stimulate the Science and Art department's mischievous system of examination grants, the transformation of all but the strongest grammar schools into schools of science, the entire discouragement of literary instruction and ruinous competition between new and old institutions. The great school boards, assisted by the Education department, had endeavoured to compensate for the lack of secondary education within their areas by the creation of 'higher grade schools,' which, in some respects, partook of the nature of secondary schools, while, in others, they resembled the higher primary schools of the continent. These, also, became competitors, in some places, with the older schools under boards of governors, while they bred confusion in the public mind as to the respective functions of 'elementary' and 'secondary' instruction. The Bryce commission, appointed in 1894 to review the whole field of secondary instruction, reported in 1896, the chief measures proposed being first, the creation of a Board of Education, under a minister, to absorb the functions of the Education department, the Science and Art department and the educational side of the Charity commission, the new body thus becoming the central authority for elementary, technical and secondary education; second, the institution of a consultative committee of independent persons competent to advise the minister; and the erection in counties and county boroughs of Local Education authorities. In the meantime, 'voluntary schools' had fallen into financial distress and denominational education suffered correspondingly. The general policy long before indicated by Matthew Arnold, reiterated by the Bryce commission and emphasised by the condition of the country and the menace of foreign competition was at length embodied in the Board of Education act of 1899 and the Education acts of 1902—3. The English state had, after a century of hesitation, consented to accept full responsibility for national education.

## CHAPTER XV

### CHANGES IN THE LANGUAGE SINCE SHAKESPEARE'S TIME

IN a general view of the fortunes of the English language since Shakespeare's time, one of the first things to strike an observer is the world-wide expansion of its use. At the beginning of the seventeenth century it was, with slight exceptions, confined to England. The exceptions were Ireland, where English colonisation had begun in the previous century, and Scotland, where literary English was already influencing the speakers of a tongue descended from the old Northumbrian dialect. Even today, English does not completely occupy the whole of the United Kingdom. Celtic exists in Ireland, in Wales and in the Scottish Highlands, while, in the Channel islands, Norman-French has by no means disappeared. Till into the eighteenth century, Cornish survived in Cornwall, and Norse in Orkney and Shetland. Outside the British isles, the language has followed the flag, and is spoken all over the empire—in Canada, in Australia, in New Zealand, in Africa, and in the East and West Indies. Beyond the boundaries of the empire, it possesses a vigorous life and literature among many millions in the United States of North America<sup>1</sup>.

Since in those regions English was planted at different times and has been subjected to varying influences, the types of language, especially as spoken, differ from standard English and from one another. The vocabulary, in particular, is notably dissimilar. Strange objects, new conditions of life, have either added native words, or caused special adaptations of old words or extensions of meaning. Sometimes, also, as in the United States, the language is splitting

<sup>1</sup> Attempts have been made to calculate how many persons employ English. Exact figures are not obtainable; but, in round numbers, 120,000,000 may be considered a tolerably safe estimate—about double the aggregate of those who speak French, or Italian, or Spanish; and half as many again as speak German, or Russian. It is believed that, in 1600, English was spoken by about 6,000,000, much fewer than then spoke French, or German, or Italian, or Spanish.



into dialects. To discuss all these varieties of English as well as the numerous dialects in Britain, with their chequered history during the last three centuries, would be impossible here, for want of space, if for no other reason. We must, accordingly, restrict ourselves to the standard literary language, which is everywhere practically homogeneous. Its principal changes we shall now consider under the three divisions of pronunciation, grammar and vocabulary.

### Pronunciation

A book printed in the early decades of the seventeenth century presents little difficulty in one respect. It can be read without much trouble; for the differences in orthography are trifling, and whole sentences may occur with present-day spelling. But, if a chapter from *The Authorised Version* or a scene from one of Shakespeare's plays were read to us with the contemporary pronunciation, the ear would be considerably puzzled to recognise certain of the words. For, while the spelling has remained tolerably constant, many of the sounds have changed a great deal.

To begin with the vowels. Middle English *ī* and *ē*, in *wit* and *men* for example, have, as a rule, continued unaltered. Not so the other vowels, whether single or diphthongal. Sometimes, one Middle English sound has, in modern times, split into several, as *a* in *man*, *was*, *path*. Sometimes different Middle English sounds have converged: *name*, *day*, which have now one and the same vowel sound, had distinct sounds (*ā*, *ai*) in Middle English. Today *see* and *sea* are indistinguishable in pronunciation. In Middle English, the former had tense *ē*, the latter slack *ĕ*; and their pronunciation was dissimilar till into the eighteenth century. This explains and justifies the rimes in Pope:

But for the wits of either Charles's days,  
The mob of gentlemen who wrote with ease;

and in Cowper:

I am monarch of all I survey,  
My right there is none to dispute,  
From the centre all round to the sea  
I am lord of the fowl and the brute.

The vowel sound in *sea*, *meat*, *heat*, *treat*, *deal* was then identical with the vowel sound in *day*, *name*: it is now the same as in *meet*, *feel*, *see*. There are exceptions, however: *great*, *break*, *steak* have not followed the example of the others. Middle English *ō* also

had a tense and a slack value. Tense  $\bar{o}$  changed to  $\bar{u}$ , which remains in such words as *too, soon, moon*. Sometimes  $\bar{u}$  has been shortened and made slacker: hence, the sound we have in *book, good*. Slack  $\bar{o}$  has been diphthongised to the sound heard in *go, stone, coat*. Middle English  $\bar{u}$  was unrounded in the seventeenth century. Then, in words like *sun, son, come* it was lowered to its present value; but, in other words, it was again rounded, as in *bull, full, put*. Consequently, *cut* and *put* no longer rime. Middle English  $\bar{i}$  and  $\bar{u}$  were gradually diphthongised till they acquired their modern sounds, as in *wine* and *house*. The diphthong *oi* has now the same sound as in Middle English; but that does not imply that it has undergone no change. It altered from time to time till its accepted value closely resembled the current pronunciation of the diphthong in *wine*, to which it was then assimilated. Dryden rimes *coin'd, mind; choice, vice; join, line*. Similarly, Pope rimes *night* with *doit, mind* with *join'd*; and writes:

Waller was smooth; but Dryden taught to join  
The varying verse, the full-resounding line,  
The long majestic march, and energy divine.

In those days, the *oi* sound was considered 'low' in such words as *join*; now it is correct, while the other pronunciation is vulgar, dialectic, or comic as in 'strike ile.' The influence of the spelling helped, in comparatively recent times, to restore the old sound of *oi*.

During the last three centuries the consonants have, on the whole, been more stable than the vowels; but they, also, have suffered certain changes. In words like *night*, *gh* seems to have been mute by 1600, while the vowel received compensatory lengthening. In *laugh, enough, thought, sought, gh* continued to be pronounced into the seventeenth century, though not unmodified. Then it disappeared, or was replaced by an *f* sound. In the same century, the *k* sound was vanishing from *know, knee*, and the *g* sound from *gnaw, gnarled*. The first step was for *kn* to become *tn*—a combination still heard in parts of Perthshire and Forfarshire. J. M. Barrie (*Auld Licht Idylls*, chap. VIII) has *T'nowhead* instead of *Knowhead*. Colonel Lovelace (*To Lucasta*) could sing,

For whether he will let me pass  
Or no, I'm still as happy as I was.

But the voicing of *s* in *is, was*, and other words, has made such a rime inadmissible, though Byron (*Childe Harold*, IV, 1473—5) and Keats (*Lamia*, 126—7) employ *was* with voiceless *s*. Certain

s sounds changed in the seventeenth century to *sh*, as in *passion*, *sure*, *sugar*, *ocean*, *nation*; others to *zh*, as in *leisure*, *osier*, *usual*. During the same period, *t* following *s* or *f* and followed by *l*, *m*, or *n*, regularly became silent, as in *castle*, *chestnut*, *Christmas*, *soften*. Towards the close of the eighteenth century, changes started in the pronunciation of initial *h* and *wh*. *H* came to be regularly dropped, but it has since reappeared in standard speech, partly because of the spelling, partly because it had been retained in Ireland and Scotland. So strong was the reaction that *h* is now heard in words where it had all along been silent, as *herb*, *hospital*, *humour*, *humble*. One of the marks of Uriah Heep's vulgarity is his iteration of 'umble. In words like *when*, *white*, *wh* began to be levelled under *w*. Purists have sought to revive the sound of *wh*, especially where confusion might result, as in *whet* contrasted with *wet*. In recent times one of the most noteworthy developments has been the loss of *r* as a trill. Dr Johnson speaks of the 'rough snarling sound' of *r* in his day. Now, it is lost medially before other consonants, and finally, in most cases, except in combinations where a vowel sound follows, as *far away*. Early in modern English, *r* modified preceding vowels. Contrast Middle English *sterre*, *hert*, *herte* with present-day *star*, *hart*, *heart*; and note the modern sound of *clerk* and *Derby*. In addition, *r* levelled distinct vowels under one sound, as in *bird*, *word*, *fur*; while it sometimes caused a vowel murmur to develop, as in *fire*, *fair*, *cure*.

Phonetic changes do not necessarily make a language better or worse in its essential character of an instrument to reveal our thoughts. The modern pronunciation of *house*, *wine*, *fair* need not be more expressive, or less expressive, than the older pronunciation. But, in certain instances, the change may produce ambiguity or may be useful only for puns. In the following groups, for example, the words were formerly distinct in sound but are now identical—*father*, *farther*; *no*, *know*; *ruff*, *rough*. Phonetic change, as we have seen, forbids rimes formerly allowable, as *days* with *ease*, *makes* with *speaks*, *great* with *cheat*, though poetic tradition may admit an obsolete rime and call it an eye-rime, as *love* with *move*. On the other hand, new rimes may develop: the change in the sound of Middle English slack *ē* now permits *sweet* to rime with *meat*. Alliteration may, also, be upset by an altered pronunciation. When *chivalry* is sounded with initial *sh* (as if the word were a recent importation from France) instead of *tch*, the alliterative effect in Campbell's *Hohenlinden* is ruined—

And charge with all thy chivalry.

The untrilling of *r* may spoil<sup>1</sup> the force of onomatopoeia, where that depends on the 'rough snarling sound.'

In Middle English, words of French origin (as *courage*, *honour*, *nature*) sometimes had the stress shifted from the last syllable to the first. This tendency has increased in modern English, and in such words the stress is now permanent on the first syllable. In certain words, the throwing back of the stress has taken place quite recently. In the seventeenth century, *big'oted* had the stress and spelling of *bigot'ted*. The spelling lingered into the eighteenth century, as in Burke's *Present Discontents*. Till about 1820, *balco'ny* was almost the only stress. Cowper, in *John Gilpin*, has

At Edmonton his loving wife  
From the balcony spied;

and Byron, in *Beppo*, rimes *balcony* with *Giorgione*. *The Oxford English Dictionary* points out that, though *con'template*<sup>1</sup> occurs from the sixteenth century to the nineteenth, orthoepists generally have *contem'plate* down to the third quarter of last century. Since then, *con'template* has more and more prevailed. Similar shifting of stress is found in *concentrate*, *confiscate*, *compensate*, *demonstrate*, *enervate*, *illustrate*, but not in *remonstrate*. Some eighteenth-century authorities stressed the last syllable of *recondite*, others (as Dr Johnson) the middle. Dr Johnson's way still has followers; but *The Oxford English Dictionary* stresses the first syllable. Till about 1800, *revenue* regularly had the stress on the middle syllable, a pronunciation which to a much later date was current in legal and parliamentary circles.

In spite of the changes in the pronunciation of English since the close of the sixteenth century, the spelling has altered little. Middle English spelling was phonetically defective; but, still, every writer tried to make it represent his own pronunciation. The result was a varying orthography. This continued into the modern English period, with additional variations caused by attempts at etymological spelling. In the early years of the seventeenth century, the same volume, sometimes the same page, has such differences as the following: *beene*, *bene*, *bin*; *detter*, *debter*; *guests*, *ghests*; *yles*, *isles*; *vitaile*, *virtuals*; *hautie*, *haughtie*; *hee*, *hee*; *least*, *lest*. But it began to be felt more convenient to keep one spelling for a word; and, by the end of the eighteenth century, our orthographical system was practically in its present shape. Early in that century, *Robinson Crusoe* has *surprize*, *lyon*, *tyger*.

<sup>1</sup> 'Con'template,' said Samuel Rogers, 'is bad enough, but *bal'cony* makes me sick.'

*cloaths, taylor*. Fifty years later, *controul, publick, dutchy, cryer, interiour* occur in Burke's *Present Discontents*. Johnson spent much time and trouble in adjusting what he calls our 'unsettled and fortuitous' orthography; but he confesses that he was often obliged 'to sacrifice uniformity to custom': to write *convey* and *inveigh*, *deceit* and *receipt*, *fancy* and *phantom*. An examination of his *Dictionary* will show that he successfully anticipated the orthography that triumphed, or, perhaps, his way commended itself to writers and printers; for, with a few exceptions like *chymist, domestick, dutchess, translatour*, his spellings are ours.

Modern spelling is marked by two features: fixity (such diversities as *judgment* by the side of *judgement* notwithstanding), and an almost entire dissociation from the spoken language. Phonetic representations like *bet, fin, hop, put*, are few. On the whole, we spell by the eye, not by the ear. The ear helps little in a language where one sign may represent several sounds, as *ch* in *which, chemistry, machine*; and *i* in *pick, pike, pique*; or where one sound may be represented by a variety of signs, as in *go, oath, stone, dough, sow, sew*; and in *call, keen, deck, chaos, quoit*.

Though a fixed orthography has not generally checked phonetic change, the spelling has, in certain instances, helped to restore an older pronunciation, as noted before in regard to *oi* and *h*. So, too, in words like *backward, forward, Edward*, where, in the seventeenth century, the *w* sound was regularly dropped. The *n* sound is now generally heard in *kiln*, where it became mute in early modern English. A number of words had letters inserted, rightly or wrongly, as a clue to the etymology. In some of these, the insertion has not affected the pronunciation, as *b* in *doubt*; *c* in *scent, victuals*; *g* in *foreign*; *l* in *salmon*; *s* in *island*. In others, the letter has gradually come to be pronounced, as *c* in *perfect, verdict*; *th* (for *t*) in *apothecary, author, anthem*; *l* in *fault, vault, falcon, solder*. The struggle of *perfet* to keep its ground against *perfect* is visible in Milton's poems, where *perfect* and *imperfect* occur thirty-four times, twenty-two of them without *c*. His *Areopagitica* has *perfeted* and *autority*. *Fault* was pronounced without the *l* sound till into the eighteenth century. Pope rimes it with *ought, thought*; Dr Johnson says, 'The *l* is sometimes sounded, sometimes mute. In conversation it is generally suppressed'; and Goldsmith writes,

Yet he was kind, or, if severe in aught,  
The love he bore to learning was in fault.

At the present day, *solder* and *falcon* may be pronounced with or without *l*; while *falconry* and *falconer* have no *l* sound.

Finally, three of the eccentricities of English spelling and pronunciation may be mentioned. Originally, the noun *ache* differed in spelling and in pronunciation from the verb *ake*, as *speech* from *speak*. About 1700, however, the noun began to be confused in pronunciation with the verb, and then in spelling. Dr Johnson registers both forms but makes no distinction. He derives the word—wrongly—from Greek *ἄχος*, and, consequently, prefers *ache*. For both words we now have the spelling of the noun and the pronunciation of the verb. The old pronunciation of the noun lingered as a stage tradition into the nineteenth century, which explains the saying of the O.P. rioters (1809), 'John Kemble's head aitches,' where they gave the verb the sound of the noun. Evidently, Thackeray considered this pronunciation sufficiently well known to his readers in 1849—50, for he writes—perhaps imitating Shakespeare's pun in *Much Ado*—

... Lady Brouncker; who was a druggist's daughter, or some such thing, and as Tom Wag remarked of her, never wanted medicine certainly, for she never had an *h* in her life. (*Pendennis*, chap. vii.)

*Bowl*, a vessel, and *bowl*, a ball, are now spelled and pronounced alike. Originally different, they continued distinct into the eighteenth century. Later, the pronunciation of the former word and the spelling of the latter came to be adopted for both. *Colonel*, with the first *l* sounded as *l*, was trisyllabic in the early part of the seventeenth century, as in Milton's

Captain or Colonel or Knight in Arms.

Soon after the restoration it became disyllabic. 'It is now,' says Dr Johnson, 'generally sounded with only two distinct syllables, *col'nel*.' But another form *coronel* had lived in popular usage; and, in the nineteenth century, while the spelling with *l* remained, the pronunciation with *r* was adopted.

### Grammar

The story of English grammar is a story of simplification, of dispensing with grammatical forms. Though a few inflections have survived, yet, compared with Old English, the present-day language has been justly designated one of lost inflections. It is analytic, and not synthetic. This stage had virtually been reached by the beginning of the seventeenth century, though certain modifications have taken place since then.

One of those is the supersession, in the standard language, of verb forms like *cometh* (originally midland and southern) by northern forms like *comes*. In the early seventeenth century, the prose usage was still *-eth*. *The Authorised Version* has nothing else. In poetry, especially dramatic poetry, the form in *-s* was a licence borrowed from colloquial speech, and helpful for metre or euphony, as when Shakespeare has in *The Merchant of Venice*,

Who chooseth me shall get as much as he deserves;

and

It blesseth him that gives and him that takes.

For a time, the custom prevailed of writing *-eth*, but pronouncing *-s*. In 1643, Richard Hodges says,

howsoever wee use to write thus, *leadeth* it, *maketh* it, *noteth* it, *raketh* it, *perfumeth* it, etc. Yet in our ordinary speech... we say *leads* it, *makes* it, *notes* it, *rakes* it, *perfumes* it.

He also gives a list of words 'alike in sound and unlike in their signification and writing,' where we find such groups as,

*Cox, cocks, cocketh* up the hay.

*Furze, furreth, furs.*

*Jests, gests, gesteth.*

Mr *Knox*, hee *knocketh* many *knocks*.

*Rites, rights, wheel-wrights, righteth, writeth.*

*Waits, weights, waiteth*<sup>1</sup>.

Gradually, *-s* predominated, but *-eth* did not disappear. It was heard in church, though, even there, *-s* was frequently sounded instead. In *The Spectator* (no. 147), Steele denounces

a set of readers, who affect forsooth a certain gentlemanlike familiarity of tone and mend the language as they go on, crying instead of *pardoneth* and *absolveth*, *pardons* and *absolves*.

In an earlier *Spectator* (no. 135), Addison speaks of

the change which has happened in our language by the abbreviation of several words that are terminated in *eth*, by substituting an *s* in the room of the last syllable, as in *drowns, walks, arrives*... which in the pronunciation of our forefathers were *drowneth, walketh, arriveth*. This has wonderfully multiplied a letter which was before too frequent in the English tongue, and added to that hissing in our language, which is taken so much notice of by foreigners; but at the same time humours our taciturnity and eases us of many superfluous syllables.

In the days of the romantic revival, poets resuscitated the *-eth*, which continues to live in poetry and, also, to some extent, in prose. The poet finds it advantageous for rhythm, or rime,

<sup>1</sup> Ellis, *Early English Pronunciation*, iv, 1018 ff.

or euphony. Swinburne, in *Atalanta in Calydon*, rimes *saieth* with *breath*, while Tennyson, in *The Lady of Shalott*, sings,

And so she weaveth steadily,  
And little other care hath she.

Another inflectional shortening occurs in the *-ed* of verbs. In early modern English, the weak vowel here was dropped in the spoken language, except, of course, in forms like *mended*, *rooted*. In the higher language, however, *-ed* was fully sounded after all consonants, especially by poets for the sake of metre, who naturally also dropped the vowel if necessary, as Shakespeare in

Hugg'd and embrac'd by the strumpet wind.

Gradually, the colloquial usage encroached upon the literary. In the passage of *The Spectator* already cited, Addison protests against this loss of a syllable.

'The same natural aversion to loquacity,' he says, 'has of late years made a very considerable alteration in our language by closing in one syllable the termination of our praeterperfect tense, as in these words, *drown'd*, *walk'd*, *arriv'd*, for *drowned*, *walked*, *arrived*, which has very much disfigured the tongue, and turned a tenth part of our smoothest words into so many clusters of consonants.'

The full syllable has lived on in the liturgical language, where we have *blessèd*, *cursèd*, *belovèd*, *believèd*.

During the last two centuries, the second person singular of verbs (as *lovest*, *lovedst*, *wilt love*) has gradually vanished from ordinary usage. This has gone hand in hand with the disuse of *thou*. In Middle English, French influence led to the employment of *ye*, *you* as a ceremonious substitute for *thou*, *thee*; and, by 1600, the plural had come to be the regular polite form of address, while the singular remained chiefly in family use (parent to child, master to servant) and for contempt. *Thou*, consequently, became generally obsolete, though still retained in poetry, in liturgical language, sporadically in dialects, and by quakers—who employ *thee* as nominative construed with third singular. The surrender of *thou* is, to some extent, a loss. English has no longer the advantage of a familiar as well as a polite style of address nor the clearness arising from the power to make a formal distinction in number.

Further simplification in the verb is found in the disappearance of subjunctive forms. The only remaining parts are *be* and *were*, and the forms without *-s* in the third singular of the present tense. The syntax, also, of the subjunctive has greatly shrunk since Middle English days, and is still shrinking. At times, however, the tendency has been checked. In the seventeenth and the



eighteenth century, *were* of rejected conditions and unfulfilled wishes seemed to be regularly giving place to *was*. But it has recovered lost ground, and in such constructions *was* for *were* is now a distinct vulgarism. The subjunctive, however, has been entirely or almost entirely abandoned in the following—indirect assertions: ‘I think he *be* transformed into a beast’ (*As You Like It*); indefinite adjective clauses: ‘a prone and speechless dialect such as *move* men’ (*Measure for Measure*); concessive clauses regarded as real: ‘no marvel though thou *scorn* thy noble peers, when I, thy brother, am rejected thus’ (*Edward II*); and clauses of future time. The last construction is still, occasionally, found, especially in poetry: Tennyson writes,

Till in all lands and through all human story  
The path of duty *be* the way to glory.

At the present time, Othello’s ‘Judge me the world’ would regularly be expressed by ‘Let the world judge me’; and, generally, forms with *may*, *might*, *should*, *would*, are, for clearness, preferred to simple subjunctives. In ‘Hadst thou been here, my brother had not died,’ the apodosis would take the compound form.

Other syntactical losses since Shakespeare’s day include the constructions ‘good my lord’ and ‘I know thee who thou art’; *against* and *without* as conjunctions; the ethic dative; the accusative and infinitive as subject, now superseded by the construction with *for*: ‘for a man to behave so is absurd’; *be* as the auxiliary of perfect tenses in certain intransitive verbs, a usage still existing in instances like ‘he is gone.’ In the Elizabethan age, *me* as the ethic dative was sometimes felt to be obscure and was easily mistaken for the direct object. This ambiguity Shakespeare (*The Taming of the Shrew*, I, 2, *ad init.*) seized upon to bewilder the clown Grumio—

*Petruchio.* Villain, I say, knock me at this gate  
And rap me well, or I’ll knock your knave’s pate.  
*Grumio.* My master is grown quarrelsome. I should knock you first,  
And then I know after who comes by the worst.

These old usages have been revived in recent times in poetry and historical fiction; but, unless skilfully and sparingly employed, they are apt to offend, as when Stevenson overdoes the ethic dative in *The Black Arrow*.

In certain nouns, the same combination of sounds may stand for different ideas. To the ear, *horses* represents the genitive singular as well as all the plural cases. To the eye, this defect is

so far remedied by the device of the apostrophe: *horse's*, *horses*, *horses'*. This distinction began to appear in the seventeenth century, but it was not a settled usage till the eighteenth.

'The gradual restriction of the apostrophe to the genitive,' says Henry Sweet in his *New English Grammar*, 'apparently arose from the belief that such a genitive as *prince's* in the *prince's book* was a shortening of *prince his*, as shown by such spellings as *the prince his book*<sup>1</sup>.'

The employment of *his* for the genitive suffix was most prevalent from 1400 to 1750. In the sixteenth and the seventeenth century, it was chiefly used with proper names ending in a sibilant, or to avoid an awkward inflectional genitive. It occurs in Dryden, as in *Astraea Redux*,

Such is not Charles his too too active age.

The *Prayer Book* of 1662 has, 'And this we beg for Jesus Christ his sake.' *The Pilgrim's Progress*, part II, has 'Gaius his kindness to Feeble-mind.' Many an old tome is inscribed 'John Smith his book'; and the usage (which still survives, in book-keeping for example) was turned by Dickens into a joke in 'Bill Stumps, His mark.'

Many changes exemplify what Addison calls humouring our national taciturnity, while they do no injury to clearness of expression. Old and Middle English revelled in multiplying negatives for emphasis. The practice was retained by the Elizabethans; but, in time, the principle prevailed that two negatives contradict each other and make an affirmative. In standard English, we now find one negative only, though, colloquially, we may still hear the old redundancy. Double comparison, another Elizabethan characteristic—Ben Jonson reckoned it an elegance of style, 'a certain kind of English Atticism'—began to die out in the seventeenth century, and now survives only as a vulgarism. Occasionally, however, it appears in poetry, as in Swinburne's *Atalanta*,

Touch the most dimmest height of trembling heaven.

The desire to lop off superfluities accounts for various types of omissions, as *of* in 'That is no use'; the verb after *to* in 'Are you going?'—'I should like to,' or 'He must leave now, though he doesn't want to'; and *it is* in 'as usual.' Swift still wrote the last in full (*Gulliver's Travels*, part II, chap. I), 'Whereof three or four came into the room, as it is usual in farmers' houses.'

<sup>1</sup> 'I might here observe that the same single letter [s] on many occasions does the office of a whole word and represents the *His* and *Her* of our forefathers.' Addison, *The Spectator*, no. 135.

Further condensation is seen in the wide use in modern English of the attributive noun instead of a phrase more or less lengthy. The usage began in Middle English, and has been vigorously extended in present-day language. It is regularly employed in all kinds of new phrases, as when we speak of *birthday congratulations*, *Canada balsam*, *a motor garage*. Compound expressions are similarly applied, as *loose leaf book manufacturers*, *The Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act*, *a dog-in-the-manger policy*.

The attributive noun is not an isolated phenomenon in English. It belongs to the widespread tendency whereby a part of speech jumps its category. The dropping of distinctive endings made many nouns, for example, identical with the corresponding verbs; and, consequently, form presented no obstacle to the use of the one for the other. The interchange was also facilitated by the habit of indicating a word's function or construction by its position in the sentence. This liberty became licence in the Elizabethan age. 'Almost any part of speech,' says E. A. Abbott, 'can be used as any other part of speech<sup>1</sup>.' Later usage has been more restrained, but of the liberty advantage has been amply and profitably taken. The following are examples of nouns converted into verbs in recent times: *ape*, *balloon*, *burlesque*, *cartoon*, *dovetail*, *gas*, *laager*, *lampoon*, *loot*, *palaver*, *sky*, *tailor*, *telescope*, *tiptoe*, *tool*; of verbs into nouns: *build*, *flutter*, *haul*, *shampoo*, *sip*, *sneer*, *sneeze*, *splash*, *tinkle*, *trend*; of adjectives into verbs: *grey*, *tidy*. To distinguish the double function, the pronunciation is sometimes varied, as *a good rec'ord* but *to record' it*; *an agèd man* but *he ag(e)d rapidly*.

An extreme instance of this freedom appears in sentences transformed, for the nonce, into attributes, as when Dickens writes, 'a little man with a puffy "Say-nothing-to-me-or-I'll-contradict-you" sort of countenance'; or into verbs, as in Browning's lines,

While, treading down rose and ranunculus,  
You 'Tommy-make-room-for-your-uncle' us.

One might have expected that the tendency to simplify would lead English to abolish the strong conjugation with its numerous complications; but, apparently, any bias towards uniformity has been counteracted by conservatism linked with the superiority which the strong verbs possess in clearness, brevity and ease of pronunciation. Weak forms have, indeed, been adopted, as *crowed* for *crew*, *climbed* for *clomb*, *melted* for *molten*. On the other

<sup>1</sup> A *Shakespearian Grammar*, Introduction *ad init.* and § 290.

hand, certain verbs, as *dig* and *stick*, formerly weak, are now strong. It was in the eighteenth century that *dug* prevailed over *digged*, which is the only form found in Shakespeare, *The Authorised Version* and Milton. *Dug* and *stuck* are easier sounds than *digged* and *sticked*. Within the strong conjugation, numerous changes have been made. In the sixteenth and the seventeenth century, there was a general movement towards supplanting the form of the perfect participle by the form of the past indicative. Shakespeare used *mistook* for *mistaken*, *drove* for *driven*, *wrote* for *written*. Goldsmith and other eighteenth-century writers did the same; and, in their days, *drank* threatened to supersede *drunk*. In present-day English, the original participles have, as a rule, been restored, though *stood* has permanently displaced *stonden*.

Other parts of speech have been regularised. One instance is the modern distinction between *who* and *which* as relatives. In the Elizabethan age, these pronouns could refer indifferently to persons and things, a usage which lasted into the eighteenth century. In the first half of the preceding century, they had seemed likely to drive out *that*; but, in time, *that* recovered lost ground and even encroached upon the others. Steele (*The Spectator*, no. 78, cf. no. 80) sets forth the grievances of *who* and *which* in a petition to Mr Spectator—

...your petitioners, being in a forlorn and destitute condition, know not to whom we should apply ourselves for relief, because there is hardly any man alive who has not injured us. Nay, we speak it with sorrow, even you yourself, whom we should suspect of such a practice the last of all mankind, can hardly acquit yourself of having given us some cause of complaint. We are descended of ancient families, and kept up our dignity and honour many years, till the jacksprat *that* supplanted us.

Later in the eighteenth century, *who* and *which* came again into favour; and the three relatives have since been advantageously employed to fulfil different functions.

In Elizabethan English generally, a strange welter appears in the cases of pronouns—nominative for accusative, accusative for nominative. Since then, order has been, for the most part, restored: nominative and accusative are, as a rule, correctly employed. We have still, however, such expressions as 'Who is that for?' But 'It is me' is not frequent till the first half of the eighteenth century. Before that, 'It is I' was general. In Middle English, the two methods of comparing adjectives—by inflection and by periphrasis—were employed indiscriminately. Later, the method was regularised; and inflectional comparison

became restricted to monosyllables and to such disyllables as the addition does not make discordant. Sixteenth-century writers supply examples of what we now consider uncouth shapes—*eloquenter, virtuouiser, artificialest, excellentest, famousest, learned'st, tediousst, unwillingest*. Sometimes, the pages of recent poets and prose-writers bristle with forms like *daringest, wonderfulest, wretcheder*.

In Middle English and early modern English (for example, in Shakespeare and *The Authorised Version*), *shall* and *will*, when employed as auxiliaries, are not in conformity with present-day usage. This established itself in the seventeenth century, but only in England. It never got a footing in the Scottish or the Irish dialect; and natives of Scotland and Ireland find it hard, if not impossible, to acquire the standard system with its intricate rules<sup>1</sup>.

By the beginning of the modern English period, *do* was in regular use as an auxiliary; and it seemed as if the forms with *do* and *did* were to oust those without. At first, no fixed principle guided the employment of *do write, did write*, for *write, wrote*. It might be euphony, or perspicuity, or metre, or caprice. Compare the following:

So they did eat, and were filled.

*Mark*, viii, 8.

Rejoice with them that do rejoyce, and weep with them that weep.

*Romans*, xii, 15.

It lifted up it head, and did address

Itself to motion.

*Hamlet*, i, 2, 215 f.

In the early seventeenth century, however, the language began to restrict *do* to certain special functions. 'Does he write?' came to take the place of 'Writes he?' 'He did not write' the place of 'He wrote not.' In affirmations, the custom arose of avoiding *do* except for emphasis, or in particular cases where the order of words requires it, as in 'So quietly does he come,' 'Nor did he hesitate.' But the indiscriminate use of unemphatic *do* did not readily vanish; and that gave point to Pope's gibe in 1711,

While expletives their feeble aid do join.

In his *Dictionary* (1755), Johnson brands unemphatic *do* 'as a vicious mode of speech.' A quarter of a century later, he writes (*Lives of the Poets*), 'The words *do* and *did*, which so much degrade in present estimation the line that admits them, were in

<sup>1</sup> Gerald Molloy's book on the subject has as its sub-title 'The Irish Difficulty'; and J. M. Barrie (*When a Man's Single*, chap. xvii) uses the mystery to poke fun at a fellow-Scot.

the time of Cowley little censured or avoided.' In spite of Johnson, later poets have gladly availed themselves of *do* and *did* for purposes of metre. Till recent times, *doest* and *dost*, *doeth* and *doth* were not differentiated in use. In vain one searches the 1611 edition of *The Authorised Version* to find why *doth* appears in one place, *doeth* in another. The nineteenth century made *doest*, *doeth*, the verb of full meaning, *dost*, *doth*, the auxiliary.

But, during the last three centuries, English has not merely been regularised and simplified. It has also devised new grammatical material to improve the old or replace the lost.

One of the most striking inventions is *its*. A clear and unambiguous possessive was required for neuters, in place of the old *his* and the stopgap *it*, both felt to be inconvenient. The earliest known instance of *its* is in Florio's *Worlde of Wordes* (1598), where part of the explanation of *spontaneamente* is 'for its owne sake.' Though in colloquial use before this date, the new pronoun found favour in literature very slowly. It does not occur in the 1611 edition of *The Authorised Version*. A few examples appear in Shakespeare, but only in plays printed after his death, while three are met with in Milton's poetry and some in his prose. *Its*, however, was too useful to be ignored, and, by 1660, had won a place in the language. The idea that it was an upstart had disappeared before the end of the century, and Dryden censured Ben Jonson for writing in *Catiline*,

Though heaven should speak with all his wrath at once,

remarking '*Heaven* is ill syntax with *his*.' So quickly was the old usage forgotten.

Our period has also established a new verbal—the gerund. This form originated in the use of nouns in *-ing* preceded by *the* and followed by *of*. The preposition was frequently omitted, a construction which lasted till through the eighteenth century. Steele writes, 'a very great difference between the reading a prayer and a gazette'; Swift, 'you owe the cultivating those many virtues'; and Goldsmith, 'the gaining two or three battles, or the taking half a score of towns.' But *the* had also been dropped, as in Shakespeare's 'Deserve well at my hands by helping me'; and this shorter form was destined to prevail. Though always retaining certain noun functions, these *-ing* forms were considered to belong to verbs; and, by analogy, others were constructed which had not and could not have nouns to correspond, as 'He boasts of *having* won the game,' 'He was annoyed at *being contradicted*.'

In the syntax of the gerund, a genitive case or a possessive pronoun must sometimes precede, as 'we could prevent his knowing it.' To express the same notion, a variant construction is 'prevent him knowing,' found frequently in recent writers. This has been attacked as ungrammatical and illogical, but is defended on the ground of long descent and greater concreteness.

A noticeable feature of the English verb is its wealth of tenses, whereby precise and accurate expression is given to many shades of meaning. Though our mode of tense formation by auxiliaries began in Old English and was gradually extended in Middle English, it has been, for the most part, settled and developed in modern times. Forms like *I am writing* existed long ago; but it was well into the seventeenth century before the current distinction arose between *I am writing*, the actual present, and *I write*, the present of general application or of habit. 'Our friends all stay for you,' in *The Merchant of Venice*, and, 'Behold, three men seek thee,' in *The Acts of the Apostles*, show the usual mode of expressing the actual present three centuries ago, while the regular form today would be *are staying* and *are seeking*. The double forms are also distinguished in the past and the future tenses. The corresponding passive forms in *-ing* were much later in origin than the active, and at first met with fierce opposition, in spite of their manifest convenience and freedom from ambiguity. Constructions like 'The house is being built' and 'Rabbits were being shot in the field' have not been traced further back than the last decade of the eighteenth century. These forms, however, were inevitable, since English makes a wider use of the passive voice than any other modern literary language. How untrammelled the English passive is, may be seen in the fact that, not content with a construction like 'A book was given him,' the language has devised 'He was given a book.'

Two other constructions may be mentioned. The genitive in *-s* must stand immediately before its governing noun or separated therefrom only by qualifiers. This produced the peculiar modern usage by which *-s* is detached from the word really governed, and attached to some group containing that word, as 'The father-in-law's gift,' 'The Duke of Oldenburg's dominions.' The detachment has gone too far in 'The man I saw yesterday's attempt,' where the relative clause is regarded as united with *man* to make one compound word. Another innovation, involving a minor change, is 'the split infinitive,' when a word or phrase is inserted between the *to* and the verbal part of the infinitive. Though

existing in Middle English, this construction seems to have become most common in the second half of the nineteenth century. It has been defended on the plea of occasional superiority in clearness and emphasis. Purists, however, have energetically denounced it and sometimes branded its presence as a sign of stylistic depravity. And certainly many examples are extremely ugly and in very bad taste.

The extent to which English grammar has been simplified, has tempted some to speculate whether it could not be simplified still further. They have suggested that we might dispense with *these* and *those*; and might drop *s* in the third person of the present tense. Others demand the evolution of fresh material—new pronouns of the third person for indirect speech, and a new pronoun, of singular number and common gender, to refer to *everyone*, *each*, in order to avoid the inconvenience of ‘Everyone did what *they* could’ or ‘Each did *his* or *her* best.’

### Vocabulary

During the last three centuries, the vocabulary of English has displayed the characteristic marks of a living tongue—words have become obsolete, words have altered in meaning, words have been created. In addition, many words have been borrowed, and the borrowing has been world-wide.

It is sometimes hard to determine if a word is really obsolete, for it may linger in obscurity and then suddenly emerge. *To thief*, found in Old English, then for long unrecorded, reappears in the seventeenth century. Through their occurrence in the *Prayer Book*, in the Bible, and in Shakespeare’s plays, many expressions, though disused in ordinary speech and writing, have remained in knowledge and can hardly be termed obsolete. Again, the romantic revival restored old words to literature, some of which have returned into general use. To this class belong words like *dight*, nearly lost in the eighteenth century but revived in the nineteenth; *elfish*; *hue*, archaic about 1600, afterwards reintroduced as a poetic synonym for colour; *to jeopard*; *to smoulder*; *soothfast*, brought back by Sir Walter Scott.

Some words naturally fell out of use with the objects they denoted, as *crowd* (fiddle), *spontoon* (half-pike). But, in many cases, the exact reason for disuse is obscure. It may be to avoid ambiguity or to obtain greater vividness, the feeling that a word is played out or merely the longing for novelty. The following



are examples of words obsolete in the standard language since Shakespeare's time: *accite*, *bisson*, *brickle*, *cypress* (gauze), *end* (gather in harvest), *gent* (graceful), *grin* (a snare), *hent*, *makesport*, *neeze*, *nesh*, *pink* (small), *rear* (half-cooked), *terrestrious*, *uneath*. Other words may be regarded as archaic, employed to impart an antique flavour to speech or writing, as *an* (if), *anon*, *astonied*, *beuray*, *certes*, *coil* (uproar), *ear* (to plough), *eld*, *feat* (adroit), *fere*, *glister*, *gobbet*, *lazar*, *leasing* (falsehood), *leman*, *murrey*, *nim*, *peradventure*, *sennight*, *sooth*, *targe*, *thole*, *thrall*, *throughly*, *vails* (perquisites), *yare*.

When we meet an obsolete word, its strangeness puts us on our guard: not so a word which, while still in common use, has undergone a change of meaning. Its familiar appearance lulls the mind into accepting it at its most familiar value, while, in reality, its meaning is quite different. Shakespeare's 'Security is mortals' chiefest enemy,' the Biblical injunction to the receivers of the talents 'Occupy till I come,' the petition in the *Prayer Book* 'that they may truly and indifferently minister justice,' must frequently be misunderstood. Some thinking is required to discover the precise meaning of Swift's 'whole pack of dismals coming to you with their black equipage,' while Goldsmith's 'loud laugh that spoke the vacant mind' is often so quoted as to betray misapprehension of what he meant by *vacant*.

In some of the numerous words which have altered in meaning during the last three centuries the change is slight, in others it is very great, in all the result is a real addition to the capacity of the language. When a name is required for a new mechanical invention, for a new idea, for a disturbance in the body politic, instead of coining a word, we may employ an old word with a new sense. The application of *mule* in spinning, of *train* in railways, of *negative* in photography, exemplifies how inventions divert words into new channels. Sometimes, as in the case of *train*, the new channel comes to be one of the most important. Nineteenth-century politics gave new meanings to *conservative*, *unionist*, *liberal*, *radical*, as seventeenth-century troubles did to *puritan*, *roundhead*, *cavalier*, *covenanter*. The new use may originate in the desire for a fresh and vivid designation, which at first may be dubbed slang, as *guinea-pig* (a paid director), *go baldheaded* (to stake all and disregard consequences), *blackbird* (negro), *garret* (head). The fact that *presently* now means 'by and by' testifies to the universality of procrastination. *Conceited* no longer signifies full of imagination, full of judgment, but suggests

thinking too highly of oneself, since one's estimate of oneself inclines to be too high. *Censure* acquired its notion of fault-finding because we are apt to be harsh in judging others. Words may change for the better, or for the worse; may be widened in sense or narrowed. *Politician*, nowadays, does not necessarily connote scheming, nor does *emulation*, as formerly, convey the bad meaning of envy, malicious rivalry. *Clever*, in the eighteenth century, was, according to Dr Johnson, 'a low word scarcely ever used but in burlesque or conversation; and applied to anything a man likes, without any settled meaning.' On the other hand, *officious* has dropped its former good sense of obliging; *disgust* has taken the notion of loathing; and *blooming*, because employed as a euphemism, now bears the sinister meaning it was intended to gloss over. Romantic writers elevated the meaning of *bard* and *minstrel*, narrowing, also, the latter, which is no longer applied to buffoons and jugglers. *Science* has been severely restricted in its most common use, while, except in dialect or as an archaism, *meat* has ceased to mean food in general. Figurative usage is frequently the starting point of a permanent change in sense. *Copper* may designate something made of the material, as a coin or a vessel; and then, when another material is substituted, the previous name may remain. We now apply *copper* to coins of bronze and vessels of iron, just as we call one article a shoehorn though made of silver, and another a fire-iron though made of brass. Association of ideas plays a great part in transferring names. An example of this is the application of *bluestocking* to Barebone's parliament in the seventeenth century, and to a group of learned ladies in the eighteenth<sup>1</sup>. An invention, a production, a practice, may take its name from the originator, from the place of origin, or from some place or person connected with it. This, in recent times, has added an extremely varied number of words to English; as *to boycott*, *to burke*, *to shanghai*, *pinchbeck*, *mackintosh*, *gamp*, *glengarry*, *chesterfield*, *jersey*, *cardigan*, *joseph*, *ulster*, *wellingtons*, *snider*, *shrapnel*, *gatling*, *negus*, *sandwich*, *glenlivet*, *cheddar*, *gage* (in *greengage*), *mocha*, *strathspey*, *hansom*, *brougham*, *limerick*, *guy*, *mohock*. Others of this type belong, in part, to the section on derivation, since they have been prepared for use by the addition of formal endings; as *boswellise*, *bowdlerise*, *grangerise*, *macadamise*, *daltonism*, *grundyism*, *malapropism*, *spoonerism*, *pickwickian*, *fabian*, *procustean*, *peeler*. When we employ *burke* to mean stifle a rumour or an enquiry, we really

<sup>1</sup> See, *ante*, vol. xi, pp. 344—5.

make one word do the work of several, *i.e.* 'to stifle a rumour as Burke stifled his victims.' One recent example of this shortening is *wireless*, to indicate Marconi's system of telegraphy. At the end of the eighteenth century, *telegraphy* was applied to transmitting messages by moving arms attached to posts. When electricity was employed, the term was *electric telegraphy*; but, as this method predominated, it monopolised the word *telegraphy*, and *electric* was dropped. Marconi's system received the name *wireless telegraphy*, and then the adjective alone came to designate the whole.

The two chief methods of word-making—composition and derivation—are extensively employed in modern English. Composition is very prominent in Old English, especially in poetry. Later English gave up certain of the old methods of compounding. This surrender has frequently been exaggerated, and the assertion has more than once been made that English is, in consequence, weakened as a language. But, since English achieves by other means the primary end and aim of language—communication between man and man—why should it be termed enfeebled? Instead of compounding, English often prefers to make a noun do the work of an adjective or a verb, or it borrows from other tongues. And who shall say that English has done wrong in choosing loans like *disciple* and *impenetrable* rather than coinages like *learning-knight* and *undrivethroughsome*? English seems to feel that a word need not always consciously define or describe what it stands for. It is sufficient if the word designates. But modern English has kept a rich store of compounds and possesses the power to coin more. True, our poetry no longer teems with the formations found in *Beowulf*. But the practice of compounding is proved from such examples as Milton's *vermeil-tinctured*, *many-twinkling*; Gray's *feather-cinctured*, *incense-breathing*; Keats's *subtle-cadenced*; Shelley's *passion-winged*; Tennyson's *gloomy-gladed*; Swinburne's *sun-forgotten*; Arnold's *ray-crowned*; Browning's *dew-pearled*. Nor is it only the poets that employ this device. All strata of the language—from slang to poetic prose—possess compounds. They crowd our larger dictionaries in battalions, many of quite recent origin, while they swarm in newspapers and magazines, clamouring for recognition as valuable additions to the vocabulary. And, besides using native material, English appropriates foreign words and stems, which it links together, sometimes in arbitrary fashion, to produce shapes, often hybrids, 'that would have made Quintilian stare and gasp.' A few instances of these are *aerodrome*,

*autocar, bibliomania, barometer, cyclostyle, hydroplane, jocosious, kaleidoscope, megalomania, neo-catholic, neolithic, ornithorhynchus, pandemonium, panorama, phantasmagoria, photograph, pictograph, pseudo-Gothic, quasi-war, somnambulist, stereoscope, telephone, zincograph, zoology.* Many words of this type have been coined to supply the needs of inventors and men of science. English, as a rule, chooses this method of making a scientific terminology in preference to employing native terms with their intimate associations. Greek and, in a less degree, Latin are the chief sources<sup>1</sup>.

The following compounds, all modern, exemplify various modes of coining from native materials: *king-emperor, hero-worship, mad-doctor, teacup, bushranger, catspaw, clothesbrush, ballot-box, backwoodsman, sponge-cake, jackass, tomcat, tomfoolery, spokeswoman, sportsman, easy-chair, yellowback, dreadnought, holdall, knownothing, makeweight, skinflint, spoilsport, outvoter, overmantel, to outclass, to overdevelop, to caseharden, to copperbottom, to roughgrind, duty-free, colour-blind, absent-minded<sup>2</sup>, one-ideaed, one-legged, one-roomed, round-faced, great-coated, bounty-fed, jerry-built, sea-borne, sea-washed, self-governing, self-centred, highflown, cold-drawn, fresh-run, calf-bound, chance-sown.*

In forming derivatives, many of the Old English prefixes and suffixes are no longer employed. To compensate for this, unlimited use is made of foreign prefixes and suffixes.

The native prefixes most frequent in modern formations are *be-, mis-, un-* (reversal of action), *un-* (negative), as in *bespangle, bedevil; misapprehend, misconduct, misspell; unlimber, unpatriotic*. The number of *un-* words, in both senses, is enormous. The Old English suffixes *-ster, -dom, -en, -ling, -some*, are still employed, though not extensively, to make new words; as *tipster, boredom, fresher, tighten, princeling, adventuresome*. On the other hand, *-ed, -er, -ful* (for nouns and adjectives), *-ing, -ish, -less, -ly* (for adjectives and adverbs), *-ness, -ship, -y*, are freely and widely

<sup>1</sup> This appears when we examine the compounds of *tele-* and *tetra-*. 'Down to the last years of the 18th century,' says Sir James A. H. Murray, 'the only *tele-* words were *TELESCOPE* and two derivatives; then, in 1794-5 came *TELEGRAPH*, with two derivatives; but now, with *telepathy, telephone, telephotography*, and the like, the *tele-* words have grown from Dr Johnson's 2 to 130, and fill 16 columns—an example of how scientific discovery and invention have enlarged the existing vocabulary. The words in *tetra-* are even more numerous (250, besides chemical terms innumerable) and occupy 19 columns.' Nine *tetra-* words are found before 1600, twenty-one more appear between 1600 and 1800, for all the rest the nineteenth century is responsible. (*The Oxford English Dictionary*.)

<sup>2</sup> This type (adjective + noun + *-ed*) is very prevalent in present-day English.

suffixed, as *talented*, *self-coloured*, *skater*, *tobogganer*, *boxful*, *artful*, *cycling*, *homing*, *baddish*, *mulish*, *fingerless*, *tideless*, *yearly*, *suavely*, *aloofness*, *nothingness*, *championship*, *slangy*, *fidgety*. The foreign prefixes and suffixes come from Latin, Greek and French. They are not added merely to stems from their own language, but, without restriction, they combine with stems from anywhere to make new English words. The following exemplify (1) the commonest foreign prefixes; (2) the commonest foreign suffixes—(1) *ante-chapel*, *ante-diluvian*, *anti-macassar*, *anti-Darwinian*, *bi-weekly*, *bi-millionaire*, *circumambient*, *cis-Elizabethan*, *co-education*, *counter-attraction*, *counter-clockwise*, *decentralise*, *disarrange*, *disbelief*, *enslave*, *ex-Prime-Minister*, *ex-official*, *extra-mural*, *international*, *intertwine*, *non-intervention*, *pre-arrange*, *post-glacial*, *postgraduate*, *pro-tariff-reform*, *recount*<sup>1</sup>, *re-afforest*, *semi-detached*, *submarine*, *sub-kingdom*, *super-heat*, *ultra-radical*; (2) *clubbable*, *traceable*, *blockade*, *orangeade*, *breakage*, *approval*, *prudential*, *Johnsoniana*, *nitrate*, *vaccinate*, *addressee*, *auctioneer*, *Carlylese*, *leatherette*, *Frenchification*, *beautification*, *speechify*, *Addisonian*, *Byronic*, *butterine*, *jingoism*, *toadyism*, *positivist*, *Jacobite*, *pre-Raphaelite*, *hypnotise*, *oxidise*, *streamlet*, *booklet*, *bereavement*, *oddments*.

Of minor modes of word-production active during the last three centuries, the first to be noticed consists in change of accent. One word thus becomes two, differing in sound and sense, and, at times, in spelling; as *conjure'*, *con'jure*; *hu'man*, *humane'*; *ur'ban*, *urbané'*. A second mode is shortening—part of the habit common in English and frequently assailed by purists. Swift struggled for years against *mob*, an abbreviation of *mobile vulgus*; but in vain. *Mob* has proved a valuable addition to the vocabulary. Abbreviations are not additions unless the shortened form differs, more or less, in meaning from the original, or, while retaining the meaning, is applicable under different circumstances. Sometimes it is the last part of the word that remains, as *bus* from *omnibus*, *wig* from *periwig*, *cute* from *acute*, *van* from *caravan*. More frequently it is the first part that remains, as *cab* from *cabriolet*, *cad* from *cadet*, *Miss* from *Mistress*, *navvy* from *navigator*, *rake* from *rake-hell*, *tar* (a sailor), from *tarpaulin*, *tick* (credit), from *ticket*. *Port* (the wine), from *Oporto*, has lost both head and tail. Another mode has been termed 'back-formation.' The word *burglar*, for example, was regarded as containing the suffix seen in *liar*; and, by a piece

<sup>1</sup> *Re-* has been employed with special frequency since about 1850. The number of forms made with it is 'practically infinite,' says *The Oxford English Dictionary*.

of false logic, it was assumed that, as *liar* presupposes *to lie*, so *burglar* presupposes *to burgle*. Similarly *to sidle* was made from *sideling*, taken for a participle. Other modern back-formations are *to char* (burn), from *charcoal*; *to frivol* from *frivolous*; *to process* from *procession*; *to roughride* from *roughrider*; *to spring clean* from *spring cleaning*; *to stoke* from *stoker*; *to subedit* from *sub-editor*; *to sulk* from *sulky*; *to swindle* from *swindler*; *to tightlace* from *tightlacing* or *tightlaced*.

Finally, we may note words which seem to have 'sprung up'—instances, in fact, of 'root-creation.' For the most part, they are words originating in onomatopoeia, the principle underlying the poet's music, in Tennyson :

The moan of doves in immemorial elms,  
And murmuring of innumerable bees,

as well as more obtrusively in Browning :

*Bang-whang-whang* goes the drum, *tootle-te-tootle* the fife.

The term onomatopoeia has been widened to include words which, while not precisely imitating the sound, yet commend themselves to the ear as symbolic suggestions to the mind of the sound's effect. Such words continually arise. To ridicule 'swell' modes of utterance, *la-di-da* originated about 1883; *pom-pom* was a soldier's invention in 1899, during the South African war; *ping-pong* appeared with the game in 1900, *ping* itself (for the ring of rifle bullets) being then some fifty years old. A few similar modern creations are *boo*, *fizz*, *flurry*, *fribble*, *fuss*, *hubble-bubble*, *hurdy-gurdy*, *kittiwake*, *miaow*, *miminy-piminy*, *puff-puff*, *ratatat*, *snigger*, *sniffing*, *splutter*, *splodge*.

When a new term is required, rather than coin a word or burden an old one with a fresh meaning, English often borrows. The earliest known English contains loans; and, in modern times, borrowing has been extensively practised—so extensively, indeed, that, in recent dictionaries, only about one-fifth, or, at most, one-fourth, of the words can claim to be native. This, of course, is no test of their use; for, while scientific works, especially on chemistry, may be written in, perhaps, equal parts, foreign and native, the percentage of native words in works of literature may rise to 85 or 90, or even more. Taking, however, the vocabulary as it stands in a dictionary, we are justified in calling it much more composite than it ever was before. But, whatever be the elements composing our vocabulary, the mode in which they are employed is purely English. Foreign words soon cease to be treated as aliens: they

are naturalised and become subject 'to all the duties and liabilities of English words.'

In the seventeenth century, as is shown by writers like Sir Thomas Browne, there was a continual influx of Latin words, many of which, however, failed to establish themselves in the language. French influence, after 1660, checked Latin borrowing. This age was also a time of sifting of the vocabulary. A large number of words, chiefly Latin, borrowed since the renaissance, did not survive the end of the seventeenth century, and most of the survivors are still with us. Borrowing from Latin and French has gone on to the present day. The war of 1914, like other wars, seems likely to add to our stock. *Communiqué* soon secured a foothold in our newspapers not only for official communications, while, later, *camouflage* (like *strafe*) became familiar to every household. From French and from other languages of Europe we have borrowed words of commerce, of seafaring, of science, of art, of literature, of social life. War, exploration, trading, colonising and travelling have brought us words from America, Africa, Asia, Australia and the islands of the sea, while the Celtic tongues at home have added to the store. It is sometimes difficult to know the immediate source of a loan. A word may come to us from French, or it may be taken from Latin though it mimics the French mode. Words from distant lands may, for example, reach us through Italian or Spanish, through French or Dutch. English has received from French the Arabic *hourî*, *minaret*, *sofa* and *zero*; the Turkish *odalisque* and *kiosk*; the Russian *ukase*; the Mexican *jalap* and *ocelot*. From the Dutch came the Malay *cockatoo*; from the Portuguese the Persian *sepoï* and the East Indian *teak*; from Spanish the Peruvian *puma*. Italian handed on the Persian *bazaar*; an Indian vernacular gave us the Persian *shawl*. Gaelic words like *cairn*, *ingle*, *sporrán* entered English from the Scottish dialect. Many classical Greek words have been transmitted by Latin or have assumed a Latin shape, as *atmosphere*, *chrysalis*, *geology*, *monad*, *nausea*, *oasis*, *octopus*, *phase*, *phenomenon*, *phonetic*, *phosphorus*, *siphon*, *sporadic*, *thesaurus*.

During the last three centuries, the sources from which English has borrowed most freely have been French, Latin, Greek and, to a less extent, Italian. The loans are of great variety, which, in a fragmentary way, appears in the following lists. From Latin we have such words as *arena*, *axis*, *bacillus*, *cactus*, *circus*, *devastate*, *deviate*, *exert*, *facsimile*, *farrago*, *fortuitous*, *hallucination*,

*incandescent, incipient, indigenous, indulge, joke, junction, larva, maximum, minimum, mollusca, nebula, noxious, nucleus, obtrude, odium, omnivorous, osseous, otiose, par, pendulum, permeate, preclude, puerile, quadruped, quota, ratio, reluctant, sinecure, spontaneous, tact, tandem, terrific, ulterior, vertigo, veto, viaduct*; from Greek, *autonomy, cacophonous, eczema, euphemism, exegesis, heterodox, idiomatic, kinetic, kudos, meteorology, monotony, nous, orthodox, ostracise, panoply, semantic, tonic, zymotic*; from French, *avalanche, badinage, bagatelle, barracks, bivouac, bronze, buccaneer, burlesque, chauffeur, chicane, cockade, cutlet, debouch, decamp, dragoon, echelon, embarrass, façade, gala, glacier, hangar, isolation, lampoon, levee, moraine, mystify, naïve, ogre, oxygen, parachute, parasol, parade, parvenu, picnic, piston, prude, quadrille, ration, ricochet, roué, rouge (cosmetic), routine, sash (of window), séance, solidarity, sobriquet, soufflé, souvenir, tableau, terrorism, trousseau, vaudeville, zouave*; from Italian, *balcony, bravura, crescendo, dado, dilettante, extravaganza, granite, grotto, incognito, influenza, lava, martello, oboe, opera, pianoforte, quartet, regatta, semolina, sirocco, solo, sonata, soprano, terracotta, ultramarine*. From the other European tongues, the loans are far fewer though still important. The following exemplify what we owe to Dutch—*commodore, easel, gas, Hottentot, hustle, kink, maulstick, morass, ogle, roster, skate (on ice), sketch, sloop, smack (ship), splice, taffrail, tattoo (of drum), trigger, yacht*; to South African Dutch—*commandeer, kraal, laager, spoor, sjambok, trek, veldt*; to Spanish—*castanet, cigar, flotilla, garrotte, guerrilla, junto, quadroon, regalia (cigar), sambo, sierra, siesta*; to Portuguese—*albatross, cobra, dodo, emu, joss, palaver, verandah, zebra*; to German—*feldspar, gneiss, kriegspiel, lager, mangel-wurzel, poodle, plunder, quartz, swindler, waltz, zeitgeist, zinc*; to Russian—*drosky, knout, mammoth, samovar, steppe*; to Hungarian—*shako, tokay (wine)*; to Polish—*mazurka*; to Icelandic—*geyser*; to Swedish—*sloyd*; to Norwegian—*fjord, ski*; to Welsh—*cromlech, eisteddfod*; to Gaelic—*claymore, ptarmigan, pibroch*; to Irish—*banshee, Fenian, shillelagh, Tory*; to Breton—*menhir*.

When we come to Asia, we naturally find that our vocabulary has borrowed largely from the Indian languages—*chintz, coolie, juggernaut, jungle, jute, khaki, loot, pyjamas, pundit, raj, shampoo, sikh, sirdar, thug, tomtom, zenana*. We have from Persian—*baksheesh, durbar*; from Turkish—*bosh, effendi, jackal, kismet, pasha*; from Arabic—*allah, ameer, emir, fellah, harem,*



*salaam, simoom, zareba*; from Malay—*amuck, compound* (enclosure), *guttapercha, trepang, upas*; from Japanese—*jinricksha*; from Javanese—*bantam*; from Chinese—*bohea, koto, pekoe, souchong, tea*. With few exceptions, of which *kosher* may be one, words of Hebrew origin in common English use have come through other tongues.

American languages have given us *moccasin, musquash, skunk, squaw, tapir, toboggan, tomahawk, totem, wigwam*; African—*chimpanzee, gnu, morocco, quagga*; Australasian and Polynesian—atoll, *boomerang, dingo, kangaroo, taboo, tattoo* (skin-marking).

Many of these loans have interesting associations. The Polynesian *tattoo* was first made known to Englishmen in the third quarter of the eighteenth century by captain Cook; the German *plunder* reminds us of the devastating Thirty Years' war and of prince Rupert's marauders in England during the civil war; words like *easel* and *sketch, smack* and *yacht* recall the painters and the sailors of Holland, as *terracotta* and *ultramarine, opera* and *soprano* recall the artists and singers of Italy. *Tomahawk* goes back to the early English settlements near the Red Indians; *terrorism*, first recorded in English in 1795, is an offspring of the French 'Reign of Terror,' 1793—4; and the Spanish *guerrilla*, in a despatch of Wellington (1809), is a legacy from the Peninsular war. But these few instances must suffice.

The readiness with which English borrows from foreign tongues or builds words out of foreign materials, explains the existence of such pairs as *mind, mental*; *mouth, oral*; *spring, vernal*; *moon, lunar*; *son, filial*; *man, human*; *coal, carbonic*; *milk, lacteal*; where the noun is native, the adjective foreign. This is sometimes termed a defect, on the ground that the words, while connected in sense, are not outwardly linked by form. Custom, however, obviates any disadvantage the defect may have. Besides, in many cases, native adjectives exist by the side of the foreign, as *manly, human*; *fatherly, paternal*; *watery, aqueous*; *kingly, royal*. Similar pairs of nouns are *greatness, magnitude*; *length, longitude*; *height, altitude*. By means of the double forms, we express differences of meaning, or vary the phraseology according to circumstances. This advantage will naturally have little weight with those who wish foreign words expelled, whether useful or not, who, like William Barnes, advocate *demsterhood, folkdom, folkwain, pushcainling, culchewsome* for *criticism, democracy, omnibus, perambulator, ruminating*.

Barnes represents the extreme views of the supporters of the

native element in English against the foreign. This opposition is, in part, associated with the alternation in style which has been manifest, most noticeably in the domain of prose, during the last three centuries—the recurrent movement between the plain, unadorned style and the rhetorical, ornate style. Each form has ebbed and flowed: neither, however, has existed absolutely alone. Each is exposed to its own danger: the plain may degenerate into the bald or the vulgar, the ornate into the extravagant or the gaudy.

Among the Elizabethans, Lyly and Sidney had endeavoured to beautify prose. In the first half of the seventeenth century, we meet with various devices to enrich literary style, exemplified by the ‘conceits’ of Donne, Crashaw and other metaphysical poets, and, in prose, by the antitheses and tropes of Bacon, the quaintness of Burton and Fuller, the ornate splendour of Taylor, Milton and Browne. But the average reader found it difficult to comprehend their strange—often highly Latinised—vocabulary, their involved sentences, their far-fetched allusions, their bold figures; and after the restoration arose the cry for a plainer, clearer style<sup>1</sup>. A longing for an academy on the French model was several times expressed. In 1664, the Royal Society appointed a committee to improve the English language, but nothing resulted. One of the members of the committee was John Dryden, who had already (*Rival-Ladies*, dedication) lamented

that, speaking so noble a language as we do, we have not a more certain measure of it as they have in France, where they have an Academy, enacted for the purpose.

Dryden, however, was destined to take the lead in adapting the conversational English of the age to be a suitable medium for the varied aims of prose; and this simpler style he also introduced into poetry. His *Essay of Dramatick Poesie* (1668) is written in straightforward conversational English, and may be regarded, indirectly at least, as a manifesto of the new prose. A direct manifesto had recently appeared in *The History of the Royal Society*, by Thomas Sprat. There he condemns ‘this vicious abundance of phrase, this trick of metaphors, this volubility of tongue, which makes so great a noise in the world.’ He points out that the Royal Society had vigorously applied the only remedy for this extravagance;

and that has been a constant resolution to reject all amplification, digressions, and swellings of style; to return back to the primitive purity and shortness, when men delivered so many things almost in an equal number of words.

<sup>1</sup> See, *ante*, vol. VIII, chap. XVI.

They have exacted from all their members a close, naked, natural way of speaking, positive expressions, clear senses, a native easiness, bringing all things as near the mathematical plainness as they can, and preferring the language of artisans, countrymen and merchants before that of wits and scholars.

However plausible the Society's preference might seem, however admirably the vernacular was handled by Bunyan and Defoe, as later by Cobbett, however effective was Locke's plain bluntness, the unmeasured use of the language of the common people nearly destroyed literary English at the end of the seventeenth century and the beginning of the eighteenth. The language of the average man abounds in colloquial elisions and abbreviations, in careless constructions, in familiar catchwords and slang. These were indulged in by L'Estrange and other writers of periodicals and controversial pamphlets. Swift, Addison and Steele, on the other hand, sought to restore the purity of the language. In *The Tatler* (no. 230), Swift censures elisions like *can't do't* for *cannot do it*, the pronunciation of *absolves* instead of *absolveth*, and shortenings like *phizz*, *mob*, *rep*. He pillories *banter*, *bamboozle*, *country put*, *kidney*, adding 'I have done my utmost for some years past to stop the progress of *mob* and *banter*, but have been plainly bore down by numbers.'

Accordingly, he appeals to Isaac Bickerstaff to make use of his

authority as censor, and by an annual *Index Expurgatorius* expunge all words and phrases that are offensive to good sense, and condemn those barbarous mutilations of vowels and syllables.

*The Spectator* (nos. 135, 147, 165) took up the theme of abbreviations of syllables and inroads of foreign words. In the first of these papers, Addison desiderates 'something like an Academy, that by the best authorities and rules drawn from the analogy of languages shall settle all controversies between grammar and idiom.'

*The Spectator* continued, for several generations, to be the general pattern for prose. Johnson reminds us of this when he says, 'Whoever wishes to attain an English style, familiar but not coarse, and elegant but not ostentatious, must give his days and nights to the volumes of Addison.'

Occasionally, however, the model was diverged from ; and style degenerated. Then, dignity was restored to prose, in different ways, by Johnson, with his Latinised diction, his antitheses, his balanced structure ; by Gibbon, with his periphrases and his rolling

periods; by Burke, with his eloquent copiousness and his glowing imagery.

With the romantic revival came a vital change. Eighteenth-century poets, in their efforts to distinguish the language of poetry from the language of prose, had elaborated a conventional diction. The romantic poets eagerly sought to supersede this convention by vivid, appropriate words. To obtain these, they often ransacked the older treasures of the language. Prose, also, was influenced by the romantic movement, though more slowly; and, to a certain extent, was freed from artificiality and formality of diction. In the early nineteenth century, Southey is an instance of the perfection attainable in the simple style. Since then, there have been several movements away from the standard style, some of them towards elaborate, gorgeous, rhythmical prose. The earliest movement took various directions in De Quincey, Landor, Macaulay and Carlyle. About the middle of the century, contemporary with the word-painting and music of Ruskin's prose and the simple beauty of Newman's, many writers showed a tendency towards a slipshod colloquialism. The reaction that followed—the effects of which are not yet exhausted—is seen in the striving after the refinements of style associated with the names of Rossetti and Swinburne in verse, and of Pater and Stevenson in prose.

Several of the suggestions to establish a censorship of English have been mentioned. But the greatest effort was Swift's *Proposal for correcting, improving and ascertaining the English Tongue* (1712), in a letter to the earl of Oxford, then lord high treasurer. After repeating and amplifying his views in *The Tatler*, Swift asks Oxford to appoint a society with authority to remove defects in the grammar of English and gross improprieties, however well sanctioned by usage. Many words should be expelled, many more should be corrected, perhaps not a few should be restored. But the kernel of his proposal is

that some method should be thought on for *ascertaining and fixing* our language for ever, after such alterations are made in it as shall be thought requisite. For I am of opinion, that it is better a language should not be wholly perfect, than that it should be perpetually changing.

He does not, however, mean that the vocabulary is not to be increased.

Provided that no word, which a society shall give a sanction to, be afterwards antiquated and exploded, they may have liberty to receive whatever new ones they shall find occasion for.

This 'petty treatise,' as Dr Johnson terms it, had some effect, for

Oxford nominated several persons, but the death of queen Anne stopped the scheme.

One of Johnson's aims in compiling his *Dictionary* was to fix the English language; but, in the preface, he confessed he had been too sanguine.

We laugh at the elixir that promises to prolong life to a thousand years; and with equal justice may the lexicographer be derided, who... shall imagine that his dictionary can embalm his language, and secure it from corruption and decay, that it is in his power to change sublunary nature, or clear the world at once from folly, vanity, and affectation.

With this hope, however, academies have been instituted, to guard the avenues of their languages, to retain fugitives, and repulse invaders; but their vigilance and activity have hitherto been vain; sounds are too volatile and subtile for legal restraints; to enchain syllables, and to lash the winds, are equally the undertakings of pride, unwilling to measure its desires by its strength.

He hopes the spirit of English liberty will hinder or destroy an academy, but individual effort should seek to keep English from degenerating: 'we have long preserved our constitution, let us make some struggles for our language.'

Johnson's fear of degeneration has not yet been justified. And, when we survey what English has done in the past, when we see its capacity today both as an instrument of clear and exact communication and as a means of artistic literary expression, we may be confident that, instead of degenerating, it will continue to advance, and to increase in strength, copiousness and flexibility.